The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

It is hard to believe that the truce in Korea, however precarious it may seem, will be allowed to break down, for it was at the suggestion of Russia that negotiations began long weary months ago, and it may not therefore be foolishly optimistic to believe that no agreement would have been reached unless the Russians were now convinced that war no longer serves their purposes. Nor can the immense losses of her best troops be without their effect upon China, who could not continue the war for a day without Russian supplies.

The struggle for power in Russia may now be resolved, and it is possible that her new rulers may have decided that the communist empire has reached the effective limit of expansion by war, and so, of choice and necessity, are turning towards the consolidation of their huge gains by raising the standard of living behind 'the curtain'. The discontent in East Germany is a warning and an announcement that the maintenance of huge forces on a war footing is dangerously straining the communist economy.

Even in a situation so strategically favourable to the Communist armies aggression has been stopped by united action. That, which may seem little enough to us now, may prove to be of decisive importance for the future. And the Russians and Chinese must be aware that conditions which have so seriously limited the action of the U.N. forces are not likely to be accepted if the truce should be broken. Indeed Mr. Dulles has said so much. A renewal of the war would almost certainly develop into another world war, which no one could win, certainly not the Russians; and their present gains are surely too vast to be put to the hazard. In an uncertain world there are yet grounds for hopes of peace.

* * *

This issue includes three outstanding papers read at the Seventh International Congregational Council meeting at St. Andrews in June, three 'Impressions' by distinguished delegates and the 'Message to the Churches' from the Conference. There were other fine contributions from Dr. Visser 't Hooft, Dr. Russell Stafford, Dr. Elfan Rees, Dr. Leslie Cooke, Dr. H. S. Leiper, Dr. Arthur Gray and Miss Elsie G. Farris, as well as sermons from Dr. Boynton Merrill and Dr. Vernon Lewis. All these, and 'News from the Churches' in Canada, Australia, South Africa, India, Holland,

Denmark, Germany, Scandinavia, and the mission fields, will be available in the volume of *Proceedings* (Independent Press, 15s.).

We have readily surrendered our Editorial pages in order to include what we have done. We believe that the papers of Dr. Lovell Cocks, Dr. Schneider and Dr. Tudur Jones provide evidence of the high level of our spiritual and intellectual endeavour; and readers of the Impressions will gather that we were, nevertheless, far from being satisfied with ourselves.

* * *

THE well-known story of the formation of The Bible Society, which is celebrating its 150th anniversary, was briefly recalled in the London Correspondence of a recent issue of the *Manchester Guardian*. Mary Jones, unable to buy a Bible "in her own town", walked over the hills to Bala to the Rev. Thomas Charles, who, having no copy to spare for her, on his next visit to London, called together the meeting out of which grew the great Society.

"Her own town" is Llanfihangel-y-pennant in Merionethshire. It has not changed since her day. There is the church, the chapel, a Temperance hotel, a single row of cottages and the few scattered farms. It stands at the head of the lovely little valley of the Dysinni which runs into the sea at Towyn. The war brought a large military hospital, but now the valley has resumed its ancient quiet, a quiet so deep that a farmer once declared that sometimes in the evening he walked down to the river to hear the water rippling over the stones. The white farm house where Mary Jones was the maid-servant stands on the side of the road which leads only to another farm through an avenue of noble beeches, and where a tiny stone bridge crosses the river, in the shade of the trees, stands the monument whose inscription records the famous walk over Cader Idris to Bala. There are still those whose parents remembered her and were always a little surprised that the name of one so much of themselves should be written into the history of the Christian Church. She was not one of the 'mighty' ones: but how mightily has she been used of God!

The one time Vicar of Llanfihangel and the leading deacon of the chapel were old cronies and dear enemies. One Monday morning they met in Dolgelley. "Well," asked the Deacon, "did you have a good congregation yesterday?" "Let me see," replied the Vicar slowly, as if running a mental eye along the crowded pews, "there was my warden and his wife; the postmaster and his wife; the postman and his wife; the overseer and his wife; the sexton and his wife; the retired schoolmaster and his wife. Yes, quite a good congregation," and he passed on with a chuckle. They both knew that the congregation had consisted, as it generally did, of the one Anglican household in the village.

THE FOUNDATION IN CHRIST

By H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., D.D.[1]

Denominational loyalty never comes as easily to us Congregationalists as it does to some of our Protestant brethren. The Baptists have their rallying point in believers' baptism, and the Methodists theirs in a common veneration of their founder, John Wesley. But what is distinctive of Congregationalism? Our polity? But that is not exclusively ours. The Baptists and others have it too. Nor is it any longer universal among us. What, then, is distinctive of us—marking us out as Congregationalists? I am not sure I shall be able to answer that question. At any rate it is a secondary question and even an unimportant one compared with the question which now concerns us—what is the foundation of Congregationalism? What is the basis of our Churchmanship? For what is distinctive of us—marking us off from other Christian communions—can scarcely be our foundation. What is distinctive is sectional, and all too easily becomes sectarian. What is fundamental to us, in so far as we are Christians at all, is common to all the churches and truly catholic. Which means that here I am to be concerned far more with the Congregational principle than with the Congregational or Independent polity. The polity is one way of expressing and realizing the principle. We are not ashamed of the polity. It has been a precious gift of God to the Church universal. But we should not dare to claim for it what we claim for the principle—that it is the very heart and essence of catholicity. We rejoice today that there is an increasing recognition among the churches that our divisions and disunities—our schisms, if you will—are within the one Church of Jesus Christ. But if that is true, no particular ecclesiastical polity can be of the essence of that Church. We press that legitimate inference against those who make such a claim for episcopacy. But if you can have the true Church without having bishops then you can also have it without the Congregational form of government.

The catholic foundation of all the churches is laid in the Gospel, and none of us is in doubt what the Gospel is. There are many ways of formulating it. For example, we may remind ourselves of the basis of the World Council of Churches—that we all accept the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. Or we may select any one of a dozen New Testament texts: "The Word became flesh and

1 An address, slightly abbreviated, delivered to the Seventh International Congregational Council at St. Andrews.

tabernacled among us", or "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son", or "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself". The Gospel is patient of many forms of expression. Libraries of exposition and interpretation cannot exhaust its significance, yet it can be written on a post-card or even a postage stamp. And it is rendered even more tersely and compendiously than in any of the texts I have quoted by the earliest Christian creed—*Jesus is Lord.*

Everything that follows will be but the drawing out and deploying of the might and meaning of that pregnant word. If Congregationalism as a historical movement makes sense at all; if in spite of all our defections and betrayals, inconsistencies and adulterations, there has been given through us Congregationalists any contribution to the life and well-being of the Church universal, it is surely this:—that through good and evil report we have tried to take in utter seriousness the Lordship of Jesus—not only as our personal faith and public gospel, but as the indispensable and all-sufficient foundation of our churchmanship. We have claimed this Gospel of the Lordship of Jesus as the authority for our polity. If we have been justified in that claim, we must remember that whenever we appeal to this authority we are appealing to what judges our weakness and compromise and shows up all the distortions and debasements of our churchmanship. No one can say with complacency that Jesus is Lord. If we are to say it, then we must say it in fear and trembling, and as men who have no hope save in God's mercy. Yet say it we must; and maintain without wavering that if Jesus is Lord, then this Gospel is to be proclaimed to the world not only by our dedicated individual lives but also by our corporate obedience as members of His Body. Jesus is Lord—there is our authority for the Congregational way. There is our faith, our message, and the pattern of our catholicity. It is on this we stand, and by it that we must be judged. There are many still who say that we Congregationalists have no creed. Never was there a greater mistake or more serious misunderstanding of our witness. A Congregational church fellowship, so far from not having a creed, is a creed made visible. You know how an ancient cathedral preaches with the silent eloquence of arch and buttress and fretted stone. The very shape of the building speaks of the Cross. The altar pleads the sacrifice made for the sins of mankind; the font, the carvings, and the stained glass—all spell out the story of our redemption and proclaim the Gospel to the world. And so it must be with our Congregational churchmanship. Not only in the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, but in the structure of its ordered life, in the profession of faith it requires of its catechumens, in its sacred and joyful Church

Meeting, and in every detail of its work and witness, a Congregational church must proclaim that Jesus Christ is the risen Lord Who lives and reigns in His Church, and by His Spirit guides it into ever closer communion with Himself and ever wider and deeper unity with His people everywhere.

Jesus is Lord. That means He is more than Leader. The Christian Church is no philosophical sect or ethical society gathering together to honour the memory of a revered Teacher and Founder. Nor is it a cult, centring round Jesus the hero or demi-god. In spite of surface similarities, it is not akin to those mystery religions in which men found refuge amidst the howling wilderness of pagan despair. Christianity is more than a way of life, and Jesus more than a teacher of ethical sublimities. Christians themselves are more than disciples—not indeed in virtue of any spiritual maturity or prophetic insight of their own, but because Jesus is Lord—Lord of the world, Lord of history, Lord of life and death. Between discipleship and apostolate lie the Cross and Resurrection, the end of the old order and the beginning of eternity. And in the new age that has dawned Jesus is Lord, and His followers are sent forth into the world as witnesses of His resurrection and heralds of His gracious sovereignty. It is to this that we Congregationalists are committed. However the tide of the Spirit may ebb and the little ships drag their anchors when the winds of doctrine blow, except as an expression of Trinitarian Christianity Congregationalism makes no theological sense. We are not Unitarians. We are free indeed; but our freedom is within the Gospel, and not from it. It is a large liberty; for we have not loved that brittle orthodoxy which some have thought to be the Ark of the Covenant. We stand, as we have always stood, not for theological systems but for experimental religion—which means, not a creed pruned down to the limits of our understanding, but a faith whose reach exceeds its grasp, but which is at all times an absolute obedience to Jesus as Lord. Such an obedience we have no right to yield to any except to One Who is Himself God. That is why we exact no subscription to the historic creeds. Men's minds may well lag behind their self-committal, but if they are ready to give Jesus their utter allegiance, that is enough.

Yet again—*Jesus* is Lord. It is Jesus of Nazareth, who suffered under Pontius Pilate, who was crucified, dead and buried, and rose again from the dead—it is the Jesus to whom the Bible testifies that we call Master and Lord. The good news we proclaim concerns this Bible Jesus. It is this Jesus—and no other man—in whom the eternal Son of God became flesh and dwelt among us. And therefore the Bible is the indispensable witness to these mighty happenings. It testifies not only to the historic reality of this incarnate Lord but also to His mind and will for His Church, so that,

interpreted by the Holy Spirit, the Bible becomes the Word of God addressed to the Church here and now. The Holy Spirit brings no new revelation; He takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us. Our faith is thus anchored in history without being enslaved by it. And precisely because we are free from the bondage of tradition we are free to appropriate its treasures as the Holy Spirit may direct.

What, then, is our Congregational understanding of the Church? For us, the Church is simply the Lord Jesus Christ in the midst of His friends. Where Christ, according to His own promise, is in the midst of men and women who have gathered in His Name, there is the Church. This is the Congregational principle —*Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia*. But why call "Congregational" what is obviously catholic?

Yet although all Christian communions give assent to the principle, some of them regard it as affording only a vague, minimal definition of the Church, and go on to supplement it in various ways. To them, though it says much, it does not say all. But to us Congregationalists it says everything. It can and must be expounded, of course; but it does not need to be supplemented. It needs only to be taken seriously.

We Congregationalists have laid great stress on the voluntary nature of church membership. We have sometimes made it appear that our church covenants, in which we promised one another that we would walk together in the way of Christ, were the corporate acts whereby our churches were established. This contractual conception has even been taken to be our chief contribution to Christian thinking on the nature of the Church. Perhaps it has never been formulated more clearly than by the philosopher, John Locke, who, himself a product of English Dissent, has directly or indirectly influenced English Congregationalism not a little. "A church," he writes, "I take to be a voluntary society of men, joining themselves together of their own accord, in order to the public worshipping of God, in such a manner as they may judge acceptable to Him, and effectual to the salvation of their souls." Locke then proceeds to draw from his definition certain inferences which are familiar to us. Locke has in view the Independent Churches of his own day. And if we are looking from the outside and with secular eyes at churches that still retain the Independent polity, there is much to be said for Locke's definition. From the standpoint of the lawyer and the sociologist, an Independent church is merely one among other voluntary societies. It ranks with the trade union and the tennis club; is structurally similar to these; and like these enjoys the rights that belong to all lawful associations and groups in a democratic community. When the question at issue

concerns legalities—title deeds, trusts and the rest—Locke's definition is very much to the point. But when we are defining the Church theologically—when we are exhibiting its nature as a religious reality—John Locke has nothing to contribute to the discussion. The qualities of being a voluntary covenanted association and having a democratic constitution may be inseparable accidents, but they are not the essence of the Church as Congregationalists understand it.

The Church is the Church God gathers. Its foundation is in His free grace, and its beginning is in His saving Word. It is from above, not from below; from heaven not from men. Thus the first thing to be said about the gathered Church is that it is the New Israel—the *holy* people of God. 'Holy,' of course, is to be understood in its primary meaning of 'set apart.' We are set apart by God for His own possession. The holiness of the Church is not our spirituality and moral perfection. Our trophies of victory over temptation, our advance in godliness of living—these are precious indeed as evidence that the sanctifying Spirit is at work within us, but it is not on these that we dare rest our claim to be God's holy people. But though we are sinners still, we are called to be saints. We have been chosen and separated by a divine election that does not depend on any merits of ours, actual or foreseen, but upon God's undeserved loving-kindness. We are gathered into the Church, as we are saved from our sins, by grace alone.

The sign of this free, electing grace of God is our baptism. The ordinance proclaims the Gospel of a divine grace that set us apart from before the foundation of the world, called us in Christ, and in His Cross wrought the 'finished work' of our salvation. It speaks of a Father who loves us while we are yet sinners, and of a Christ who for our sakes conquered sin and broke the power of death before we were born. Baptism declares that the child of Christian parents is already within the Covenant, and it is the visible sign of his incorporation into the people of God.

But the reality of the gathered Church is not yet fully before us. We have to take into account the faith that responds to grace. Not for nothing did our fathers maintain that the Church consists of *believers*. The Church claims in Christ's name the children, inquirers, and learners, who are not fully committed to Him. The destiny of all such is to become by faith what they already are according to the divine intention, and from their number God is constantly adding to the fellowship of believers. But it is this fellowship, gathered in the name of Christ, that for us is the Church as visibly and empirically known. The Church is the company of responsible Christians. It consists of those who are justified by faith, who from their hearts acknowledge Jesus as Lord

and themselves as individually responsible to Him, not only for their own personal walk and witness, but also for the corporate obedience of the Church to His royal will.

At this point we touch the issues of contemporary ecumenical debate. There are those who tell us that to find the visible Church in the company of believers is not to find it at all in any sure and unambiguous way. Faith cannot be seen, and only God knows who the true believers are. There are others who misunderstand the doctrine of justification by faith, imagining that Protestants identify justifying faith with pious feelings of peace and assurance. These charge us with attempting to base the visible Church on the shifting sands of human subjectivity. The Church, they say, must be manifest to the world as a massive objective Fact. There must be marks whereby men may recognize the people of God. Unless our salvation is to be put in jeopardy and our assurance of it utterly destroyed, this objectivity of the Church—its character as one, holy, catholic and apostolic—must be placed beyond the reach of human sin and error in the absolute certainty and infallibility of divine grace.

What are we to say in reply to all this? In the first place we must correct that disastrous misunderstanding that identifies justifying faith with subjective feeling, and then supposes that we of the Reformed tradition are maintaining that, where faith is, there is the Church. It seems necessary to say over and over again that faith is not feeling, but trust and self-committal; and that justification by faith means not that we are saved by the intensity of our spiritual ecstasy, or in proportion to the quality and steadfastness of our obedience, or even by our good intentions, but simply by taking God at His word and relying on His promises made and sealed to us in Christ.

This is what we mean when we say that the Church is the company of believers, and this is what we mean by the faith that justifies. And when we are asked what is the objective element, the massive, unchanging Fact which manifests the reality of the Church, we point to the Word preached and the Sacraments administered. For behind the Word so preached and acted stands the Incarnate Word, at once historic and contemporary—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever. The Word that creates and guarantees the Church can be no other than the object of the Church's faith and the content of its message. When we say "Jesus is Lord" we are at one and the same time proclaiming the Gospel, avowing our faith in it, and claiming our inheritance as true and obedient subjects of the King. The objectivity of the Church is the objectivity of the Gospel it proclaims, and to which its life is conformed. And as for authority, warrant, or title deed,

where can there be authority more decisive, guarantee more secure than the promises of God declared in His Word?

We may expect the criticism that our doctrine of the Church is 'low' rather than 'high.' It will be said that the company of believers gathered round Christ—though a true and precious conception as far as it goes—fails to do justice to the reality of the Church as that is shown to us in the New Testament. It lacks depth and solidity. It is in two dimensions rather than three. We shall be told that we have not come to terms with the organic character of the Church as the Body of Christ; that the Church is more than a company of believers held together by allegiance to a common Lord and a covenant freely made with one another; that to be "in Christ" is to be incorporated into that Body of which He is the Head and which, furnished with organs to discharge its apostolic, priestly and prophetic functions, is a "continuous, visible, historical society" throughout the centuries. In particular, it will be said that we do not make room for the apostolic ministry—the episcopate—which is at once the symbol of this continuous, historic life, and the divinely appointed channel whereby it is transmitted from generation to generation.

Now, as Congregationalists, we have to take this criticism very seriously. There have been times when we have lost the vision of the great Church because we have been preoccupied with an independency too prickly and parochial. All the same, Congregationalism at its best has not failed to recognize what John Owen called the "organical" character of the Church. Nor has its emphasis on the priesthood of believers obscured for it the significance of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments as the chief organ whereby the apostolic function of the Church is discharged. The Christian community is not just a collection of individuals gathered round a common Master. It is a real community, with a common life so rich and full, that those who participate in it are members one of another, and bring their varying gifts to the discharge of functions, differing in nature, but all subserving the life and health of the whole. But membership in this Body is not by physical inherence but by moral decision—by an act of grace on God's side and the response of faith on ours. And if it be said—as truly it may—that to the mystical Body of Christ belongs a communion of Christians with one another and a participation in the life of the triune God infinitely more rich than our faith can understand, yet it is also true that, as it is by grace that we become men in Christ, so it is by faith that we abide in Him. And as there is no higher gift than grace, so also there is for us in the days of our pilgrimage no closer communion with Christ and with God than simple faith affords.

But there is danger when an analogy is turned into an identity. Take "the Body of Christ," as many do today, not as metaphor but as literal truth, and then the next step is to identify the Church with world-wide *institution*, sacrosanct, unreformed, and irreformable. And then the Church usurps God's place and claims for itself the absolute authority that belongs to Him alone. We have seen the same mistake made in the sphere of political and social theory. The organic analogy is obviously useful in our understanding of human community. But turn the analogy into an identity, and you have the Hegelian worship of the State with its twin children—Fascism and Communism. In theology it leads straight to the ecclesiastical totalitarianism of Rome. All this seems necessary to say because what may be called the institutional aspect of the Church is apt to be predominant in ecumenical discussion. Of course there is obviously a sense in which the Church is an institution among other institutions. This is one side of that ambiguity which is inseparable from the historical existence of the Church in the world. But the essence of the Church is not to be sought in its institutional aspect. That is why we rejected John Locke's definition. And the institutionalism that stems from the conversion of organic analogy into an identity we reject too, not only because pushed to extremes it menaces us with the totalitarianism of the papacy, but also because, even in more moderate form, it transfers the entire discussion of the nature of the Church from the appropriate religious context to that of legalism and legalistic conceptions.

Take, for example, the claim that the Church is not there in its fullness, or even at all, unless it possesses an episcopate standing in the Apostolic Succession. One can conceive a situation in which this claim might be justified. But it is a legal, forensic situation. Let me illustrate what I mean. Let us suppose that it is discovered that the College over which I have the honour to preside—Western College, Bristol—had been left by some eighteenth-century Congregationalist a legacy which had never been paid over to us. Since its foundation over two hundred years ago, our College has been located in many different places in the West of England and has changed its name more than once. In order to claim the legacy we should have to establish by means of title deeds and other documents our identity with the institution to which the legacy was bequeathed in the testator's will.

Now is the Christian Church an institution of this kind? If it is, then those are right who claim that the contemporary Church must be able to prove its continuity and identity with the apostolic Church by title deeds and such an evidential fact as an official Ministry standing in due succession through the centuries to the first Apostles. But is the Church *in essence* an institution? And is

its historic continuity so constituted and guaranteed? We may leave on one side the question whether the Apostles really appointed successors in the sense required or whether, on the other hand, the true successor of the Apostles is not rather the New Testament which embodies their testimony to the mighty acts of God in Christ. What we maintain is that the discussion is being conducted in the wrong field. We are clearly on legal ground, as conceptions like 'validity' remind us. And legalism, we maintain, has no place where the essence of the Church is in question. We do not deny that the Church has its institutional side. What we *do* deny is that it is *primarily* an institution, whose authenticity must be vouched for in this legal way. Such a view does not take in all seriousness the Lordship of Jesus. For Jesus is the risen, *living* Lord, present to His Church here and now. The Church is not an estate in Chancery. There is no will to execute, for Jesus is alive. There are no executors, for there is nothing for them to do.

All the words He ever spoke
Still to us He speaketh:
All the bread He ever broke
Still for us He breaketh:
Still the faithful Shepherd feeds:
Jesus lives, and Jesus leads.

This is our answer to those who claim that the episcopate is the essential Ministry in the Church upon which all other ministries depend. The essential Ministry in the Church is that of the risen Lord Christ Himself. "Still the faithful Shepherd feeds," the great High Priest from Whom all our ministers receive their ordination.

But this said, we may allow that there is much we can learn from those who prize episcopal succession. The visible Church is indeed continuous in history, and we Congregationalists have been prone to forget this. We have no insuperable objection to episcopacy as such, and in the united Church of the future we may come to understand and value it. Perhaps we may even find in the apostolic succession, when we come to share it, a very eloquent symbol of the continuity of the Church's life across the centuries. But I trust we shall continue to deny, as we now deny, that it *constitutes* that continuity. By God's grace we already stand in the real apostolic succession, for it is in the contemporary Christ, the living Lord, that the Church's life across the centuries is summed up and secured. And as for the historical continuity—the outward succession—that is surely to be sought in the unchanging Gospel itself—the Word of God which, generation after generation, creates and replenishes the community of believers as it is proclaimed from

faith to faith. Let Forsyth be heard here: "The apostolic continuity is in the function not in the entail; in the Eternal Word proclaimed, not in the unbroken chain prolonged. It is in the message, not in the order of men."

The Church is also the fellowship of the Spirit. It is by the Holy Spirit that the Lord Jesus is present to the two or three gathered in His name. It is through the Holy Spirit that He makes His will known to them. And it is through the Holy Spirit that they acknowledge His royal authority and render Him the free, glad obedience of their faith. Which brings us to the Church Meeting and the problem of authority.

The Church Meeting has been the distinctive institution of our Independent polity. But it is more than that. It is a symbol and expression of the very essence of the Church: it proclaims that Jesus is Lord. We can scarcely claim too much for the Church Meeting—provided we ourselves take it seriously. At the present time many of us are far from doing this. In Great Britain, at any rate, we have not yet fully understood its far-reaching implications or to what new and revolutionary action they commit us. In Scotland there are churches that have no Church Meeting in the full sense of the word. And in England there are only too many churches who have let it fall into decay. But it is not of these churches that I am thinking when I say that we have not yet taken the Church Meeting seriously. I am not thinking of our lamentable failure to practise what we preach, but rather of the peddling poverty of the sermon itself. The old, stiff, isolationist Independency is still a power among us. Now it is true that in England, at least, Independency began as a persecuted religious minority, so that its gathered churches were isolated from each other by force of hard circumstance. It was left to a later generation of Independents to make a virtue of necessity and from being isolated to become isolationist. These valued the Church Meeting as the organ of the autonomy of the local church. All that can be said about the rights, powers and privileges of the two or three was taken to apply to the local gathered church and to that alone. And there are still many of that way of thinking among us. But this is to be sectarian with a vengeance—or else completely secular—in our view of the Church Meeting. It is to be sectarian, because this rigid Independency virtually unchurches those communions of our fellow Christians which do not possess this particular ecclesiastical institution. This is to be guilty of the same arrogant error as Rome. It is also secular; for in the end this isolationism merely sprinkles with a few drops of holy water the ordinary forms and practices of Western democratic society. By what right is the presence of Christ and the guidance of the Holy Spirit claimed for the local church and denied

to the county union, the provincial synod, the national assembly, or to this International Council? On what grounds can it be maintained that Christ is more surely present and the Spirit's guidance more authentically given to the individual church than to the fellowship of churches? If, as we maintain, the local fellowship is the catholic Church of Christ outcropping at a particular place, so also is the synod and any other fellowship of churches gathered through their responsible representatives under the authority of the Lord Christ, and in order to do His will.

You will realize that I am merely drawing out the implications of that Congregational principle which I have been expounding, and which is enshrined and made visible in the institution of the Church Meeting. But perhaps I can do something to make it all clearer if I make a minute change of expression. Instead of talking about the Church Meeting as an institution like the United States Congress or the British Parliament, let me talk about the Church *meeting*—replacing the noun by the verb. The Congregational (or Independent) polity identifies the two or three gathered in Christ's name and acting under His authority with a particular *institution* —the organ of the autonomy of the local church, the Church Meeting (noun). But the Congregational principle sees in any assembly of Christian believers, responsibly gathered together to discover Christ's will for His people and to be led by His Spirit, the Church *meeting* (verb). The institution is a notable and valuable expression of the principle—but clearly it is only one expression of it. And we British Congregationalists must recognize what our American brethren know well enough—that the pattern of the Church Meeting can be repeated over and over again—*is* indeed repeated—in so far as synods, church assemblies, national unions of churches are what they profess to be—gatherings of responsible Christian believers, who seek to do Christ's will under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Let these but become what they are—and in them is manifested the catholic Church.

But does not the problem of authority remain on our hands? If we concede to synods, and other assemblies of the wider fellowship, the kind and degree of authority that belongs to the Church Meeting of the local community of believers, are we not immediately faced with a theoretical contradiction and a practical impossibility? How can the local church still retain its full authority in and under Christ if the like authority is to be conceded to the wider fellowship? How, in practice, are two absolutes to be adjusted to one another?

The problem of authority is not to be solved on legalistic ground or by any ecclesiastical carpentry. On that ground, and by that means, the problem is quite literally insoluble. You cannot have two absolutes jostling one another. For in this field authority is

backed by coercive power. But in the Church where Christ is truly Lord the problem not only ceases to be insoluble—it ceases to exist. For here authority is not magisterial but moral.

It can never be imposed; by its very nature it must be freely acknowledged and accepted. Although everything is done in Christ's name, infallibility is neither claimed nor conceded. Yet we are not left without guidance. There are some attitudes and policies for which Christ's approval cannot be claimed. We cannot be isolationist in His name, or self-sufficient; nor may we ignore the loving counsels of the wider fellowship. Neither can we coerce one another in Christ's name. But we may and ought sometimes to yield to one another, and even to limit our freedom of action for love's sake. We ought always to cherish and encourage one another in Christ's name and maintain and extend the fellowship of all with each and each with all.

Some of our Catholic brethren find themselves driven to hold that, if by some catastrophe all the bishops in the world were wiped out, the Church would soon come to an end for lack of the essential apostolic Ministry. In such circumstances, they say, Christ would need to become incarnate once again in order to re-found the Church. It is hard for us to take that seriously. But if the Church is not constituted by the historic and apostolic episcopate, the only alternative seeems to be that it consists of the two or three with Christ in the midst. And that means that the two or three really are the catholic Church. In an emergency, they may be the faithful remnant in the midst of an apostate Israel, who must be ready to act in Christ's name, and begin a reformation in His Church without tarrying for any. And that emergency—remember—is always with us. For the Church stands in need of continual reformation according to the Word of God. Again and again in history the Holy Spirit has broken down ecclesiastical institutions and reduced the Church to its simplest terms. And we Congregationalists, to whom it has been given to see the Church in its simplest terms as the two or three gathered in Christ's name, have tried to stereotype this shining pattern into the isolationism of a Laodicaean Independency. But originally Independency did not spell isolationism—it spelt *initiative*. It was in the interests of a reformation without tarrying for any that the early English Independents claimed autonomy for their local churches. And so far from standing for that sectarianism that unchurches all who stand outside "the garden walled around," Congregationalists, when they are true to their principles, seek to fulfil themselves in ever more closely-knit fellowship with all who love the Lord Jesus Christ.

But the principle must be taken seriously, whatever happens to the polity. As under the cross of persecution, so also in face of the

irreligion and secularism of the modern world, the Church must be streamlined, reduced to its simplest terms to the greater glory of God. When in France today the priest-workman of the Roman Church sets out the sacred elements of the Mass on a kitchen table, there—according to his belief—is the catholic Church in the plenitude of its sacramental power. Is Rome to be thus stripped for the race while we Congregationalists walk heavily in antique brocade? Where is our boasted flexibility? Are we really the Catholic Church, or are we no more than a middle-class movement that has lost its bearings in the modern world? Or do we by God's grace hold the key to that grand simplification of the Church whereby the Word must penetrate the hard crust of the insurgent proletariat? Let the two or three gather in homes and factories, in the Universities and in the professional guilds, the employers' associations and the trade unions, in parliaments and municipal councils. And wherever they gather in obedience to their Lord, there shall the catholic Church be.

Let us therefore become what we are. Where Christ is, there *already* is the Church; and when He commands, the two or three must act without tarrying for any, as trustees of the whole Body. Yet it may be taken as a mark of their catholicity that they are continually going out beyond their own borders, and beyond their present grasp of saving truth, in search of yet greater fulfilment in the life of the wider fellowship. We see the two or three concerned that the Word should be proclaimed and the Sacraments duly administered, and receiving at Christ's hand the gift of the Ministry. We see them claiming their part in the treasure of Christian tradition, and at the command of Christ and under the guidance of the Spirit, enriching their corporate life with the best and truest that the past generations have learned and experienced of the Grace of God. We see them in obedience to their Lord seeking out other Christian communions, teaching and learning, taking and giving strength within the wider fellowship of the people of God. And thus in the sharing of gifts and ministries, in the preaching of the Gospel to those that are without, in humble faith and eager charity, still unfulfilled yet ever blessed, they wait in hope for the consummation of that more glorious Church which is without spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

THE FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH IN THE MODERN STATE

By Carl H. Schneider, Ph.D., L.Th.

During my personal life I have lived under all possible forms of freedom or dependence of the Church in a State; first, in a strict State Church, i.e. a Church in a State which claimed to be Christian, with the King as the highest Bishop; then in a Church totally free from the State; then in a Church which the State tried to control completely, although the State was anti-Christian; and now I live in a free Church which, however, has to fight against a Church which regards the State as only a part of the Church, and which tries to over-rule State law by the canonical law of the *codex iuris canonici*. But such a personal description cannot be the purpose of this short paper. For in order to understand the complicated problem we must not begin with personal experiences, which always are a quickly changing matter, but we have to investigate the more objective historical backgrounds, as far as they determine the relations of modern Church and modern State. For we all, States, Churches, and countries, are deeply rooted in history, even in the most modern times.

I. There is one situation in which our problem could not arise at all. Let us call it the *Byzantian* idea; the church is neither above nor under the State, it is neither State Church nor free Church; but Christian State and Christian Church are identical, "the right and the left hand of God". This has been tried not only in Byzantium, but also in the church government of many so-called Lutheran State churches since the Reformation. It is a purely ideological matter, and is based upon the belief that all members of a nation in a certain territory, and everybody in the government, are in fact Christian, and therefore members of the Church.

You might call such a Church really free, and, indeed, the history of Byzantium proves that for nearly 1,000 years no difficulties between State and Church arose. The patriarch and the emperor represented the two natures of the one Church as the two natures represent the one Christ. Shortly before the end of the Byzantine empire the Patriarch of Constantinople wrote to one of the Slavonic princes: "It is not right to say, my son, we have a

church, but we have no emperor. For the empire and the church are one identical unit, and even now when the heathen surrounds the empire of the emperor, the church gives him all her authority, dignity, honour, prayer and intercession, since he is the emperor of all Christians."

From Reformation times to 1918 many German churches were of this Byzantine type. The emperor of Prussia, the King of Saxony, and the Grand-Duke of Baden were the *summi episcopi,* the patriarchs or archbishops of the Churches in their territories. They governed the Churches with the assistance of their "Secretaries of State trusted with the gospel" (die in evangelicis beauftragten Minister). He himself and they were laymen, but this was exactly according to the teaching of the New Testament renewed by the Reformation: there is no difference between priest and layman; each serious Christian is a priest. In the free German city states, as in Hamburg or Bremen, there was no *summus episcopus,* but there was the Senate of the free city.

This scheme worked very well under three conditions:

(1) The government had to be Christian by conviction, not only for reasons of political tactics.

(2) All citizens of the State had to be Christians to a certain degree. At least they had to be willing to listen to Christian arguments, so being that part of the Church which always will be the objects of home mission. But they cannot be anti-Christian by conviction; otherwise the scheme develops a dangerous gap.

(3) Concerning faith, order, life and work there may be discussion, but no schism. It is not easy to define exactly where schism begins and where discussion ends, but there must be at least a certain unity which cannot be coercive as long as the Church stands upon the foundation of St. Paul's teaching of freedom.

Since those three conditions nowhere exist in modern times—and probably only a very few exceptions ever have existed—this way of freedom for the Church is not possible in modern States.

II. The second way is the Roman Catholic way, or at least, one of the two Roman Catholic ways. For the Roman church has two kinds of ways of dealing with our problem. In States where she is in the minority and not in power, she recognizes the State as given by natural law, and is satisfied with some kind of treaty system between Church and State whereby the Church, as of divine law, is an independent partner with her own sovereignty. This creates the very strange fiction that in such states the Roman Catholic acknowledges two sovereignties. When they conflict that of the institutional Church has to dominate, at least in theory.

But this is not the normal way: it is only a concession to necessity. For as her perpetual goal the Roman Catholic Church

sees her freedom in the modern State only guaranteed when she dominates the State. Do not think this to be exaggerated. We experience it in a State with a Roman Catholic majority every day. The fundamentals are very clear; they all date back to the Bull of Bonifacius VIII, *Unam sanctam,* in its main sentence: *"porro subesse Romano pontifici omni humanae creaturae ad salutem necesse est"*: all human creatures have to be subject to the Pope of Rome which is necessary for salvation. We shall come back to this statement later: it is necessary to remember that this, indeed, is the highest form of freedom a Church can have.

Yet, it also depends on three conditions.

(1) In order to keep this power to govern a state the Roman Church has to give up the most vital Christian principles. She has to create a police force, including the medieval or modern forms of inquisition, tyranny and dictatorship, which she has always used. One should never forget that Pope Innocent VIII, or Bonifacius VIII, had exactly the same Catholic education as Hitler and Goebbels had, not to speak of other leaders in related modern States.

(2) The various experiments in history of trying to make the Church ruler of the State always ended in defeat. The Cluniac movement, the States of the Crusaders, the *dominium Petri* under the Popes, the Paraguayan Jesuit State, the modern papal State by the grace of Mussolini, all are far from being perfect, or even Christian-like, State formations. The reason is evident. A Church never becomes free when she rules. She will be entangled in all kinds of laws, orders, restrictions, in the whole vicious circle of *"Summum ius summa iniuria"* and she, obviously, becomes slave not of a State, but of the things that belong to a State, and only to a State.

(3) The Roman conception of the freedom of a Church by governing is based upon the teaching that the authority of the Church in worldly things, and the omnipotence of the Pope over the earthly rulers, are *iure divino*. You know better than I do what this conception meant in the struggles of English political and church history. But is it not a fact—and I have only to refer to the wonderful paper of Dr. Tudur Jones—that this is neither taught by the New Testament nor acceptable to many Christians? Whosover lived, or lives, in a Roman Catholic governed State knows that there is less freedom, even for the Church herself.

III. Now we come to the Protestant possibilities. Here one fundamental fact is, I think, generally understood. The Protestant Church never *is* the State, and never wants to rule a State. She recognizes that Church and State very often have to be partners in opposition. And she has only the task of seeing that this does not lead to a *contradictio oppositorum,* but to a healthful *complexio,* or, if possible, even to a *coincidentia oppositorum.*

Now the relation between Church and State is, in all our countries, in some way still dependent on ancient Germanic, Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian or other Germanic principles of law, the so-called "Eigenkirchenrecht". It is simply a fact that no Church is built somewhere in the air, but on solid ground, and this ground belongs finally to the State. Therefore no Church in the world ever can be lawfully and rightfully free from the State. It makes no difference whether the State is Christian or not Christian. But does this not imply that the State has the right to govern the Church since the Church always receives advantages from the State? This is certainly a serious consideration. The State gives to the Church all kinds of protection and assistance, even the most anti-Christian State, and even to the most free Church: does this not give it the right to govern her as much as it governs every citizen?

This consideration leads to the conclusion of the famous Diet of Augsburg of 1555, which still today is the basic foundation of many Churches in the world:—*cuius regio eius religio*—he who possesses the country, determines also the religion. This is not only said for monarchic and aristocratic, but also for democratic States, where instead of a ruler the Parliament decides all matters of the Churches. He who does not like this has freedom to emigrate, but the Church is the State's as long as she accepts the smallest favour from the State, and every Church does.

Let us see clearly: this latter statement is true in a high degree. No Church can be absolutely free in a modern State, painful and sad as this may be. For in our highly differentiated modern States every Church makes use of the State, and has to, and every use carries obligations, and every obligation represents a kind of subjection and submission, limitation and servitude.

IV. If this is true then we may only ask where the limits of this limitation are. And here we meet an excellent conception of the modern canonical law of many Protestant churches, the discrimination between *"ius in sacra"* and *"ius circa sacra"*.

The Church is free concerning the *ius in sacra,* the law of the holy things, but it is not free concerning the *ius circa sacra,* the law "around" the holy things.

This seems to work in every reasonable Church and in every reasonable State. In everything that concerns teaching, life, liturgy, church personnel, the Church enjoys absolute freedom. The State does not care whether she teaches the resurrection of the body or the immortality of the soul; whether she obliges her ministers to have a thorough theological training or not, etc.

But the State alone has the *ius circa sacra,* i.e. it alone decides all exterior questions which come into contact with matters belonging to the necessary authority of the State. Of course, the State,

not the Church, decides how high a church tower may be built, what taxes a church has to pay, whether a church may transfer money to other countries. This may, in certain cases even affect the inner church life. For instance, the State may prohibit nightly services in case the bells ring too noisily, or the organ plays so loudly that the neighbours cannot sleep.

Here, however, we already begin to realize the difficulties of this conception which at first seemed such a simple and evident solution. It sounds easy, but it is not. There are some very important difficulties. It is nearly impossible to define exactly where the *ius in sacra* begins and the *ius circa sacra* ends. There will be few difficulties with churches of a purely devotional character, churches that despise the world and separate themselves as much as possible from everything that is in the world and belongs to the world. But there will be unsurpassable difficulties with all churches who feel responsible for the everyday life of the world. For a moment it sounds convincing to say "Heaven belongs to the Church, and earth to the State", but this separation is a complete illusion, since the Church has to communicate heavenly realities to the earth. Therefore the Church cannot be satisfied with being free only in the realm of holy things, but she must be free also in the domain of earthly things: otherwise she is a monastery, but not a church.

V. Following this line, it seems to be best to desire the absolute separation of Church and State, as was first tried in the French law of 1905. The slogan, 'a free Church in a free State', seems to be the end of all riddles. Is this possible, or is it only one of the many illusions into which mankind has fallen so often, blinding itself before the real facts of life and history?

Here church history speaks, and shows us that, up till now at least, there never was a Church totally separated from the State, and therefore no Church ever was absolutely free. Some tried, as did many individuals, but they became martyrs. Take American church history, where the separation certainly was, and is, very definite. But it is not absolute. Let us imagine the Mormon church in America again made use of one of her fundamental dogmas, the necessity of polygamy for salvation, as it once was stated. The American State Government would interfere again as it interfered formerly[1]. And even if the Church claimed that this was ordered by the Holy Scripture of the Old Testament, no State would say that a free Church in a free State can live according to her own interpretation of freedom, even if she claims to fulfil God's commandments: and vice versa. As we said before, no modern Church can be totally separated from the State since she needs the State, needs its mail and railroad lines, needs its protection and sympathy.

[1] As we go to Press the American Government is reported to be taking rigorous action against a 'Fundamentalist' group of Mormons who practise polygamy —Ed.

VI. From all these impossible possibilities we may see that there cannot be any definite and general rule which guarantees the Church to be absolutely free in a modern State. Modern States are so highly complicated and differentiated, and modern social life is so interwoven that in no place is an absolute freedom possible. Let us not fool ourselves. We have experienced in our past and present history too much not to know that no Church perpetually can avoid clashes with the State and restrictions by the State as long as she really remains a Christian church. Therefore, it seems to me, there is only one way of securing the highest possible freedom of the Church in a State in which not all State members and State governors are Christian according to the New Testament, and never will be, and that is the way of mutual agreement. Of course, this gives up the possibility of any definite and fundamental once-and-for-all decision, and remains a formalistic attitude. But is this not the only way in which freedom may exist in the world?

Agreement means, at once, that each one of the partners has to give up something. The State has to gain the insight that the Church cannot simply be treated like any other human club or federation—otherwise the agreement never will work. It has to recognize that spiritual powers are not, as long as they are spiritual, subjected to any law. "The Lord is the spirit; wheresoever the spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom." So the State has to give up all attempts to judge in spiritual matters, for only the spirit can judge the spirit. But also the Church has to sacrifice. She has, voluntarily, to give up all claim in fields which the State can handle better than she can. Ecclesiastical egotism is one of the worst enemies of the freedom of the Church in a modern State.

VII. And yet, even the best agreement, with the best will on both sides, cannot prevent there being three spheres in which a struggle for the freedom of the Church in a modern State will always be necessary, and will never and in no country come to an end, even if it is sometimes postponed, maybe, even for a century. Those three battlefields are politics, education and social problems.

Let us begin with politics. We in Europe are extremely interested in the outcome of the struggle of "McCarthyism" in America with the churches and colleges. Here something seems to be happening that we have fought against for centuries: the political control of the State in the Church and the State's interference with the free teaching of the Church. Has the State the right to scrutinize the sermons of the churches whenever the State feels it to be necessary for security or intelligence reasons? What will happen in America if a preacher, maybe on the basis of his understanding of some parts of the *Acts of the Apostles* or of some of

Christ's words against the rich, preaches communism in his sermons?

For the really Christian Church built upon the third article of the Creed this is no problem whatsoever. For a really believing Church has such a strong faith that she is convinced that the Holy Spirit will guide her into all truth, so she has not to worry what her preachers say so long as they believe in and pray for the Holy Spirit. But for the State it is a very serious problem.

Must a Church agree to the State's controlling her preachers on account of political interests? This would mean that the State makes itself the highest authority in Biblical exegesis and interpretation, for the preacher referred to may have gained his political conviction from the Bible. And what if not one preacher, but a whole Church, teaches doctrines contrary to the policy of the State?

Being honest and fair, we all feel that this is a very difficult question which, maybe, cannot be answered theoretically at all. But it has to be answered in the modern State. We know by history and by experience how often churches have formed decisive underground movements against the State.

Let us look at the question from the viewpoint of the churches. Here, again, there is much difference of opinion. Since the Reformation there are two contradictory opinions which sometimes have had a detrimental and fatal effect. The one is represented mainly by our Lutheran churches of the past, and even of the present times. It says: the Church has to give up all her political freedom, and the State alone has to determine the political course. The Church has only the freedom to preach salvation by grace through Christ. Here the State is not allowed to interfere at any cost. But concerning politics the Church is not free, and has to obey. There is a famous case in German history. When, in 1632, the Roman Catholic Emperor besieged the Lutheran City of Magdeburg, the Swedish King, Gustavus Adolphus, came to her assistance. But he had to march through the territories of the Lutheran Elector of Saxony, who refused permission to him with the famous reasoning: "The emperor [i.e. the Roman Catholic emperor] is my Lord ordained by God, so I have to obey him in everything that does not concern the faith in Jesus Christ." Magdeburg was lost and destroyed. As opposed to the English reformation history the early German reformation history has no record of any Protestant action against emperor or State. The freedom of the Church here meant political obedience. It would have been very easy to fight the emperor and to destroy the Catholic powers. No body of Lutherans did it. And so it is still today. There will never be any political underground movement in strictly German Lutheran churches, even

in the East. One may suffer for the Gospel, but any form of revolution is contrary to the Church's real freedom. I need not describe the opposite view which gives the Church the right to take part in revolutions against the State, and even to execute kings—the Reformed and Calvinistic view. That means the Church is at any time free not to obey the State's policy, to form underground movements, to take part in revolutions, and finally to form the State after her own will which of course is bound by the commandments of God.

VIII. There is another sphere in which there will always be greatest difficulties, the sphere of education. Let me illustrate this in a short story which really happened a few weeks ago in our city[2]. We have there a gymnasium, of which the upper classes correspond to the undergraduate courses of a college. According to State regulations—it is a State school—in the French lectures there has to be taught, among other authors, at least one French writer of the eighteenth century. This year the French professor chose Montaigne. Now immediately the Headmaster of the College received a letter from the educational expert of the Roman Catholic bishop, a Jesuit priest and high Catholic official, saying: "It is forbidden to any Catholic student to read books which are placed on the *Index librorum prohibitorum* according to a certain paragraph of the *Codex iuris canonici*. Montaigne is on the *index*. Since you have Catholic students in your college I hereby ask you to withdraw Montaigne from your schedule." When the Professor answered that he was not bound by the *codex iuris canonici,* but by the State regulations, the Catholic students demonstrated by not bringing the books with them to the lectures.

From this story you will see how serious the situation is everywhere, even if we do not generally admit it. The educational goals of the State need not be necessarily in contradiction to the educational goals of the Church, but they are never identical. I think we should not hide our heads in the sand, but see what really happens. One of the essential parts of education is history. Let us assume the State gives to the Church the freedom of education and of independent church schools and colleges. We know what quite naturally follows, a necessarily one-sided view of the most important events in history. The picture of Henry VIII, or of Luther, will vary very much in a Roman Catholic, an Episcopalian, a Lutheran, and a Reformed school. This is even true in the natural sciences. Biology will look very much different in a fundamentalist and in a liberal school; and so on.

All our public and State school systems restrict the freedom of the Church in education as they restrict the parents. This is necessary and may even be good. And even a State which is totally

2 Speyer-am-Rhine.

in favour of the Churches cannot accept totally all the claims of the Churches. This may be hard in many cases, but it cannot be avoided. One must be happy, even in this case, if an agreement is possible, which is not always easy, and, again, requires sacrifices on both sides.

IX. There is still another point of discrepancy, the social question. Here again the freedom of the Church is very much restricted by the modern State, and in many cases has to be. This may not be so urgent in economically sound and healthy States. But take simply for an example our present-day situation in Germany. Ten thousands of refugees from the east arrive every month without practically anything. The Churches, in fact, cannot take care of them, although they do resettle them, give them work, and do what else is necessary. Most of them are Protestants. Now you may imagine that, for instance, the Roman church is not pleased when suddenly a hundred Protestant refugees are settled in a purely Catholic village. On the other hand, the Protestant church cannot be satisfied when a single Protestant family is ordered to a purely Roman Catholic village with only Roman Catholic schools, churches, institutions. What can be done? The State has only to ask, "Where is there room and what are working conditions?" and has to over-ride in many cases all protests and wishes of the Churches.

You may say this is a special case, and will not last forever. But there are other cases. One of the finest tasks of Christian charity is taking care of the sick. For this reason the Churches train nurses, Protestant deaconesses and Roman Catholic nuns. But now there are State hospitals or city hospitals which cannot ask to which Church the patients belong. Can the State take Church-trained nurses? Very often it has to, for lack of others. But the Roman Catholic Church protests against Protestant nurses in State hospitals because they do not provide the right assistance in the last unction, and Protestant churches are opposed to Catholic nurses, because they very often talk patients in a condition of suffering or absent-mindedness into conversion to Roman Catholicism. So neither the Church is free nor the State.

The more complicated the social problems in our modern States become, the more the State is compelled to supervise or even to regulate the social work of the Churches. Of course, every real Christian Church is willing to help any State in all questions of social welfare. But she cannot agree to full secularization of social work, and she very often has to look at things from a totally different angle. Here, again, there is only one way, the way of mutual agreement which must be gained from case to case.

X. All this leads us to the fact that there is no possibility of

having an absolutely free Church in a modern State. Here, as in so many other branches of modern life, we have to adapt ourselves to the possible. The State has to learn that a real Christian church is its best ally, so long as she does not seek her own advantage, but simply tries to fulfil the commandment of her Lord, which is to serve. The Church has to learn that she must be willing to sacrifice even parts of her freedom in order to make it possible for the State to fulfil its divinely appointed task to keep order in the world.

Yet, this is not all that has to be said. Jesus was greatest when He was bound to the Cross, and church history shows that the Church often was greatest and most Christian when she had not her free way but suffered under the State. The Church under the cruel hands of Roman Emperors; the unfree Churches of the Waldenses, the Lollards, the Hugenots, the Mennonites, and many others, suppressed by the State; the churches of the Balkans during the Turkish régime; at present the churches in our Eastern Zone, were far from being the worst churches; on the contrary. One might put the question whether the external freedom of the Church in this world is not too often a temptation to the Church to forget her proper calling and to feel too comfortable in this present age.

For above all questions of Church and State, even the modern State, stands the word: "our citizenship is in Heaven." That means that we have to consider all earthly forms relative, passing, even the forms of our States. The eternal kingdom is never in this world. But the State is not allowed to think that way. So there will be fundamental discrepancies always. I do not think this to be detrimental. Let me close with another personal experience. In my relatively short life I have lived under all forms of State which Thucydides and Polybius mention as possible: constitutional, monarchical, aristocratic, ochlocratic, tyrannical, democratic. But I have not seen the Church to be affected by them, at least not very much, and only in her external life. It is interesting that Luther, when writing his great Reformation book, *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church,* did not think at all of the State. The freedom of the Church is not endangered by the State, but by the powers which bind her internally: Popery—Catholic and Protestant—ignorance, selfishness, sectarianism. When we overcome the slavery of the Church under such rulers, we certainly will find a way to a modern State which will guarantee the Church as much freedom as she really needs without hindering the duties of the State. Where this is not possible, and the State does not give this freedom to the Church, the Church has the all-overcoming power and freedom to suffer, and even in the prison of an anti-Christian modern State the Lord comes to her as far as she receives Him.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE STATE

R. Tudur Jones, B.A., B.D., D.Phil.

Christ is Lord. That is the standpoint of faith. Our Congregational churchmanship has been concerned to express this conviction in the sphere of church life and government. We have, side by side with this, a long tradition of political and social action, which has reflected our endeavour to see the implications of this lordship in life generally. Christ, through His victory over death and evil, has been exalted above all powers and authorities. He sits at the right hand of God, and is adorned with the name that is above every name. This means that Christ's victory is complete and universal. This, certainly, is as yet the judgment of faith, for we await that Day when His hidden dominion shall be made manifest to all. We still have death and evil with us, and men may still choose God or Mammon. That means that death and perdition are not the inevitable end of sinful man. The possibility of choice and decision marks this era in which we live as the day of grace. As Professor Oscar Cullman has taught us to think, the powers of evil although not destroyed, are certainly broken. They are bound as with a chain. And amongst these powers must be reckoned the State.

The State is no longer free to do as it wishes. It is subject to Christ. This explains a fundamental conviction of Christians in relation to earthly government. It cannot be the supreme authority over any man. The supreme authority is Jesus Christ, and He is the real arbiter of men's destiny when they are associated together to form a State, just as He is their real lord in all other spheres of activity. This means that the Christian will not behave towards the State in a spirit of servile fear, for he must fear God more than the State. The instruments of oppression which the State may use against Christians have been robbed of their finality—Jesus is Lord of life and death, and so, the prison and the firing-squad have been stripped of their real terror.

This faith in the authority of Christ over the State will force Christians to take an attitude of criticism and opposition should the State seem to be contemptuous of its subjection to its divine Lord. On the other hand, when opportunity is given them, Christians will attempt to modify and mould the machinery and policy of the State in order that they may, through it, express their faith that it is a servant and not a lord. There is a hesitancy about the Christian

attitude about the State, which is illustrated by the fact that there is no Christian doctrine of the State. There is a lurking suspicion of the State, based on the knowledge that no one can predict when, nor where, the State will over-reach its limits. As soon as this happens, Christians must be prepared to withstand the State. Over against this suspicion is the constant conviction that the State is a thing that must be used as an institution whose true lord is Christ.

This general statement of Christian faith leaves unmentioned the question of how the victory of Christ over such a power as the State is manifested. How are we to express the Lordship of Christ in political terms? A corollary of this question is—How do we know when the State is showing rebellious tendencies? At what point must the Christian protest and resist?

Many different answers have been provided during the course of Christian history. There have been occasions when Christians have believed that the State must be honoured until it infringes upon the liberty of the Church to preach and to worship. The only conflict between the Christian and the State mentioned in the New Testament is that over Caesar worship, which provides the background for the *Book of Revelation*. This has, not unnaturally, been taken at times to mean that only when such a choice is placed before us must we disobey. But with the growth of modern democratic communities coincided the appearance of the belief that the State's pretensions must be resisted long before they reach the point when Christians have to choose between Christ and Caesar. That choice is the culmination of a long process which must be curbed long before.

What then are the demands of Christ? He came preaching the Kingdom of God. It comes with Him, and His mighty works are a sign to faith that the powers of the world to come are already operative amongst men. He calls men to repent and to follow Him. So, the coming of the Kingdom is presented as a challenge. The way of life is now open to men, but they must enter upon it by personal decision and faith. They must be born again. The Kingdom is God's alternative to the sin and death which beset men. And so, Jesus presents the Kingdom as the great challenge. It is the most important and urgent issue which man can ever encounter. It were, indeed, better for a man to lose all than not to enter the Kingdom. This means that men now stand at the cross-roads, for the possibility of this choice is put before all by the preaching of the good news. Jesus is then the crucial figure in human history, and He is crucial not only for men as individuals, but for men as they deal with one another in a vast complexity of activities and institutions. Even the State falls under the shadow of the Kingdom of God.

Jesus summoned men to a newness of life. He calls them to live by the law of love and to sacrifice self. Forgiveness, forbearance, meekness, charity and humility are the qualities which appear in the children of the Kingdom. And He meant that these qualities are demonstrated not in the outward act alone, but in the motive of the heart as well. Men who live by God's grace should be pure of heart and sincere in their fellowship with God. In short, the call to the Kingdom is a call to a perfection like unto that of the Heavenly Father. But surely, all this is unmitigated idealism, for where can men be found who are sufficient for these things? And yet, Jesus pressed this way of life as a discipleship to be undertaken. The demands of the Kingdom are relevant *now*. He does not console His followers with the thought that they will be able to love one another in some distant world where there will be no thieves, wars, slanderers or hypocrites. On the contrary, He speaks of this present world with all its evils and sin, and asks His followers to love their enemies, to forgive their persecutors, to abstain even from just retribution, and to abstain from resisting evil. Nor are the children of light to lord it over one another, but rather are they by their eagerness to serve to invert the world's normal method of deciding precedence. Jesus does not hide the fact that this is a sacrificial and dangerous discipleship—no one should undertake it without first counting the cost. And if it should happen that in the hatred the Gospel will arouse the Christian loses all, then let him look to his reward in heaven, at the time when the Kingdom of God has come, not only in hiddenness as now, but "in power".

This Gospel, when taken in conjunction with the earthly ministry of Jesus, seems to imply a forbearance and self-negation which are of the greatest possible relevance to our consideration of the State, if only because it is so completely opposed to all that we usually mean by the State, with its emphasis on power, coercion and justice. How can we justify the State in the face of all that Jesus says? It is poles apart from the Kingdom of God, if not, indeed, the very antithesis of it. At its best the State is concerned with the upholding of justice. It is able through its legislation to define what kind of justice it proposes to dispense, and through the law-courts, and the coercive power which is invested in them it can assure its citizens that that justice is being dispensed. But what is this, in the face of the demands of Jesus for a morality that goes beyond justice, and which is motivated, not by respect or fear towards legal enactments, but by love for God and man? It is very difficult to conceive of a State preserving its existence for many hours without the use of force. And yet, in the face of Jesus' emphatic rejection of the use of coercion, it is an aspect of the life of the State about which every Christian must have his doubts and suspicions.

Once again it is not irrelevant to point out that our Congregational emphasis on the voluntariness of the gathered church by analogy produced in the realm of politics an insistence that men should be governed as far as possible by persuasion, rather than by force. But even so, the force is there, and how precisely are Christian politicians to answer to their Lord for its use?

Here we are face to face with the difficulty that lies at the very root of any Christian attempt to provide a satisfactory answer to the problem of the State. There has been a large variety of answers, some of which we must pass in review.

(1) There is always the pietist answer. The State is obviously utterly opposed to the Kingdom of God, and is best left alone, for it belongs to Satan. The Christian will be wise not to take any part in government if he belongs to a democratic community, and will suffer silently and stubbornly if the State attempts to coerce him into co-operation. This view is a difficult one to defend theologically, for it runs counter to the New Testament emphasis on the universality of the victory of Christ and the statements of both Paul and Peter that honour is due to the State.

(2) The tension between the claims of Christ and the State can be resolved by saying that the State is always right. No distinction is here made between the authority of the State and the authority of God. Caesaro-papalism implied this, as did certain formulations of the theory of the Divine Right of Kings. The Christian conscience could not, however, remain quiet for long in the face of such obvious perversion of the Christian faith.

(3) Far more influential have been the theories which delimit the spheres of love and justice, the Kingdom of God and the State. The Roman Catholic doctrine sees the State as a society which is an inevitable product of man's nature. Man's nature being gregarious calls for societies of various kinds, and the society which provides a unifying centre for these is the State. Inasmuch as it derives from the nature which has been created by God, the State has God's sanction. The State's purpose is thus ascertainable by reference to the nature of which it is a product, and man's reason is able to discern whether or not the State is performing that good which it should attain. Each society has a purpose to attain, but it is the peculiarity of the State that it is an inclusive society—a *communitas communitatum*. It must not therefore infringe upon the domains of the lesser societies contained within it, and it must see that each such society respects the freedom of the others. Thus, in this doctrine, the State is brought into close connection with creation, and is indeed looked upon as deriving its sanction from God's creative work rather than from anything that happened

subsequently. The standard by which it must be judged is the law of Nature.

Without digressing too far, it may be observed that there are a number of difficulties inherent in this ancient doctrine. The State is described as being unaffected by the redemption in Christ. It is a natural society, whose effectiveness can be appraised from that creation which is as accessible to the non-Christian as to the Christian. But we come to the knowledge of God the Creator through the knowledge of Him as Redeemer—the latter precedes the former in point of time. So that this creation cannot be a neutral object of appraisal as this doctrine supposes. And through the gracious revelation of God in Christ Jesus we see that the human nature to which Roman Catholic theologians refer us is in fact a questionable entity. How can we recover that 'nature' which God created and which provides us with some indication of what the State ought to be? The effects of sin and the Fall are such as to make our nature very different from what God meant it to be. In some sense our human nature has lost its naturalness, and so the nature on which the Roman Catholic Church builds is both unknown and unknowable. It is on grounds such as these that we must decline the Roman Catholic theory as to how best to separate the State from the Kingdom of God.

(4) The doctrine of Orders presents us with another type of attempt to draw a firm line of distinction between the two realms. According to this doctrine, the State is closely connected with the fact of human sin. The State as we know it is very largely the product of human sinfulness, and yet is sanctioned by God as a bulwark against the worst effects of that sin. It preserves society from chaos, and its functions are best described in terms of maintaining order. Whereas the Kingdom of God is the realm of grace in which God's love is made manifest in the Word and Sacraments, the State is the sphere of justice where God's wrath hides His mercy towards sinful man. Both realms are of God, but no attempt should be made to blur the distinction between them or else the purity of the Gospel will be contaminated and social life will descend into chaos. Christians can take an active part in the life of the State because they have faith in the forgiving God, and because they see the State as one of the Orders ordained by the Creator for the preservation of mankind. By accepting these Orders, and serving them in all humility, the Christian actively demonstrates his faith in Christ.

It is obvious that this type of doctrine can serve as a background for very different political attitudes. It has been used in the interests of reactionary State absolutism, as well as to support democratic and revolutionary programmes. It all depends on the content

given to the words 'order' and 'sin' in the discussion of the State's duty. Thus, if 'order' means no more than the *status quo*, the tendency will be for this theory to be manipulated in support of the rights of the State against the people; if, on the other hand, the "order" which the State should preserve is the fair distribution amongst the citizens of the wealth of the country, then the theory will be a means for justifying far-reaching social changes.

Apart from the ambiguity of the theory in practical affairs, it does create a dangerous duality. The separation of the State in such an insulated manner from the Kingdom of God simplifies a complex situation. One cannot acquiesce in the supposition that the Christian ethic is best restricted to the area of private behaviour while leaving the State to follow an ethic of its own. If only for the reason that such a theory is, in fact, false to the teaching of Our Lord. The State cannot be treated as though the Redemption had nothing whatsoever to do with it.

(5) Another attempt to explain the difference between the Kingdom of God and the State—and one that is of prime importance to us—is that of Calvin. He also holds that the two spheres are widely separated, but he explicitly rejects the view that civil government is so much a matter of pollution as to be unworthy of the attentions of Christians. The magistracy is a most sacred office, because it is ordained by God to defend the true religion, the Church, the honour of God, and to promote righteousness and execute judgment. In this way, Calvin makes the true functioning of the State to depend upon the freedom of the Church. The State of itself is unable to preserve order or to promote justice. It must be taught to respect the law of God. This law is to be found in Scripture, although he admits that not all the legal precepts of the Bible are to be incorporated in the law of the land.

Calvin, thus, held that Christians should take a positive attitude towards the State, and this is the key to his peculiar treatment of the question of obedience to the State. Rulers are to be obeyed without any thought of sedition, for all power is from God. Even tyrannous rulers are to be treated in this way, for such rulers are meant by God to be a punishment for the iniquities of the people. But Calvin qualifies this statement. First of all, he says that rulers are to be obeyed only when obedience to them does not conflict with our obedience to God. If they command that which is displeasing to God, then we may disobey. But we may not indulge in open resistance as private individuals. Open resistance can be made only by the "inferior magistrates". What this means can be seen in the following century, when the English Puritans justified taking up arms against the King on the ground that Parliament constituted a body of inferior magistrates. There is hardly need to labour

the point that this conception proved fruitful in creating machinery for the expression of resistance on the basis of positive law, without challenging the whole fabric of the State. The device of a parliamentary opposition has its roots here.

History soon showed that this doctrine was not without its weakness. The very necessary emphasis that a body of earnest Christians is a means of curbing the dangers latent in the exercise of State authority was perverted to mean that the State should be subservient to the Church. The 'saints' ought to rule. Both in Geneva and in the Nominated Parliament of 1653 in England, this type of experiment was a failure. Godliness is not enough to make a politician. Much of the difficulty arose from the attempt to turn Scripture into a system of positive law—with the result that such regulations as those dealing with witches were enforced in all their barbarity. On the other hand, of course, the insistence that the State should observe the standards of justice demanded by God in the Old Testament created in men's consciences a sensitivity towards righteousness that had rarely appeared before. But there is a theological danger at the root of the Calvinistic theory. To think of the State merely in terms of the old dispensation entails a blunting of the Christian awareness of the demands of Christ upon them. Jesus came to fulfil the Law; and to organize the State on the basis of a doctrine which by-passes this crucial fact is a doubtful procedure.

(6) Lastly, there is a school of thought which has achieved considerable influence in recent years, which insists that there is no real tension between the Kingdom of God and the State. This school looks upon the teaching of Jesus as a programme to be applied directly to affairs of State. The Kingdom of God is gradually being fulfilled by the process of social and political evolution. Care for the poor and the weak can be translated into legislation and enforced by law. And in so far as this is done, the Kingdom of God is brought nearer. The capacity for love is deeply embedded in human nature, and Jesus' mission was to stimulate this faculty in such a way that individuals may be called the children of God, and the State the Kingdom of God.

This theory is able to proceed only at the expense of caricaturing the human situation and perverting the obvious teaching of Scripture. The demand of Jesus for an uncoerced and spontaneous love is the direct opposite of the coerced justice which alone the State can promote. The necessity for legislation to curb the cupidity of the rich and to secure decent living conditions for the poor is proof enough that the faculty of love in human beings is surprisingly weak and limited when left to itself. This is not to deny that the justice these improvements embody is far superior to the injustice

that existed before they were enacted. But it is justice and not love. The personal decision of faith is not a point at issue in relation to the State's justice, but to the Kingdom it is of supreme importance.

Our discussion has led us to insist on a tension between the claims of Christ and the claims of the State. It is this tension which makes the problem one of the most baffling to Christian thought. It is obvious that in relation to the Kingdom of God the State is compromised. Just as we are sinners in our personal relations with one another and fall far short of Jesus' demands, so in our political life we are equally sinners. We are able to live from day to day by the forgiveness of God, and the same is true when we deal with one another through the medium of the State. And this tension is creative. It makes us realize the limits of State action. There are many things the State cannot do, therefore the Christian will not be seduced into believing that all that is needed is good legislation. He will realize, too, that the State is a dangerous institution; like all other units of power, it continually adds to its power. The State needs to be strong, but it must not be allowed to become so strong that it need take no heed of Christian opinion. If men are to contribute responsibly to the work of the State, they must be given responsibility in those manifold spheres where the interference of the State can be dispensed with. Again, the Christian looks upon men as those for whom Christ died. He cannot allow the State to make unlimited demands upon men. He will realize that the State is, of course, concerned with men not as individuals, but with men as groups and classes, but he will see to it that the State remembers that they are men and not materials. It will be obvious to the Christian that the State must have respect for the family, and must not promote legislation which will break up Christian (nor any other) homes. Men belong to national communities, with their indigenous culture, language and traditions. As soon as the State is used as an instrument by one nation for the destruction of another, and a weaker, national community, then the Christian will not hesitate to rebuke that State. So close is the connection between the State and nationality, that there is no hope of justice until each nation has its own government. And so complex is the modern relation between nations that international concord must force upon the nations some curtailment of the sovereign rights of individual States.

A Congregationalist will thus be aware at the same time of the claims of Christ and the possibilities of politics. This will cause him embarrassment, but out of it he will create such laws and machinery of government as will ensure that the State does not arrogate to itself the honour and power which belong to God alone.

THE ST. ANDREWS CONFERENCE: IMPRESSIONS (I)

By Ralph Douglas Hyslop, B.D., Ph.D.

Let me begin by disclaiming any intention of providing an official American view of the St. Andrews Council. The Editor's invitation leaves me quite free to give my own impressions, with the hope that they may recall happy and fruitful hours to those who were present at the Seventh International Congregational Council, and provide commentary on the Official Report for those not present.

No Report can possibly convey the joy of being in St. Andrews itself, nor the warmth of the hospitality which made our stay there so memorable. It is undeniable that there is a most important contribution made to the total effect of a conference by the setting in which it meets. St. Andrews, with its constant reminders of the heroic beginnings of the Scottish Reformation, its beautiful University and its castle by the sea (not to mention its Royal and Ancient Golf Course) provided a background for a Council which combines a reverence for historic tradition with an urgent concern for the renewal of the Christian community in the modern world. One delegate speaks for himself and his wife in saying that our hearts were so filled with gratitude for our days in St. Andrews and our imaginations so fired by the experience that we are already laying plans for a much longer stay in some future year—but that will be without the fellowship created in the days of the Council itself. The latter is quite impossible to forget, just as it can neither be re-created nor captured now in words.

The high quality of the addresses at plenary sessions must surely be remarked as one of the most important aspects of this Council. Several speakers commented on the problem faced in preparing addresses long before the Council sessions. There is surely no evidence from this Council that the Holy Spirit inspires and informs only those who rise to speak extempore. Weighing the contribution made by the main speakers and that made by those who spoke from the floor in plenary sessions arranged for discussion, an impartial observer would have to conclude that the former possess greater inspiration as well as the obvious advantage of careful preparation. Though it is quite possible that the main addresses may have failed to procure from the delegates such understanding response as would enable discussion to be most fruitful, my own impression is that the discussion groups and the plenary

sessions for discussion were hampered mainly by a failure on the part of delegates to prepare for the Council with sufficient care. The platform addresses were based upon profound study of the issues and, though they were delivered in language for the most part neither technical nor obscure, they assumed a good deal of prior preparation on the part of the delegates.

It is impossible, in a brief survey of the Council, to discuss in detail any particular address delivered there. It may be of some value for one delegate to record his own total impression of the effect of these addresses. The first impression is of the truly remarkable renaissance in Congregationalism of the doctrine of the Church. The theme of the Council was 'Congregational Churchmanship' and the whole Council was admirably planned to develop that theme. Great thinking, historic Christian witness in terms of fundamental concepts, filled our minds in the morning sessions in the first three days. Though the addresses referred to were profound, and in some ways complex, their total impact was a remarkably unified one. What St. Andrews seemed to be saying to the churches was that where Christ is, in the midst of His followers, there the Church is in all its fullness, all its power. The Church is not our institution, our programme, our possession. It is Christ's, as we are His. Unless we and our community of faith really belong to Him, we do not exist as a Church.

These truths were enunciated with great clarity and force, yet the reality of Congregational churchmanship failed to impress itself clearly on my mind. I must, as I reflect upon this fact, assign the blame not to those who planned the Council, nor to those who gave addresses, nor even to those who, like myself, came with insufficient preparation for thorough and fruitful discussion of the great theme. The fault lies not in our Councils but in our churches, and thus, most certainly, in ourselves considered not as delegates, theologians, pastors or laymen, but as Christian disciples. We are beginning to give expression intellectually to a great conception of the Church. It may even be that we are beginning, in ways yet unrevealed, to *be* the Church we are talking about. But if that is the case, there is very little evidence as yet that we have begun to understand our witness in thought and in life as one.

I felt often at St. Andrews that we were being confronted by convincing witness to the power of historic Christian tradition as it was mediated by our fellow Congregationalists. So confronted, we sought in vain to appropriate this witness as one proceeding from the very heart of our churches' life. But our hearts were not really in this task. We felt the injustice of identifying this true Church, as defined in principle, *only* with our churches and with

no others. Though we did not precisely admit it, this may have been because we could not honestly testify that our own churches were being described at all when Lovell Cocks described the Congregational principle. At several points during the Council the disturbing thought occured to me that our 17th century predecessors proceeded to such definitions of the Church as they made, from the basis of their own liberating experience of Christ in the congregations He gathered, while we seemed to be talking often about the Church which has not yet come into being.

It will be said that these comments fail to take account of the fact that we were necessarily confined, during a good part of the time at St. Andrews, to discussion of the theory of the Church. That is true, but it is also true that we are those who quite consciously deny the existence of any theory of the Church which can be considered apart from the reality of the life of Christ in the fellowship of His followers. Therefore, our theory is itself, of necessity, testimony concerning our experience of Christ. As a fellowship, I fear we are not able to give such convincing testimony that our discussion of churchmanship becomes for all of us a form of witness, in which we feel our whole Christian commitment is involved. We are, as a matter of fact, more fully engaged when the discussion turns to social questions; the discussion groups at St. Andrews seemed to prove this.

It is dangerous to prophesy, but the temptation to do so is great as one looks back on St. Andrews. For this Council seemed to express above all else the faith that we shall become what we know ourselves by the grace of God to be. If this paradox annoys you, remember that we are the children of the Reformation who have determined to take with complete seriousness the doctrine of justification by faith as it applies not only to the individual but to the whole Church. St. Andrews expressed that understanding of the Church which is closest to the New Testament and therefore to the Reformation in its fullest and most radical formulation. It is not strange that we felt that our understanding was incomplete without deeper and more universal experience of that Church. We can testify that the Church, about which we speak, lives—for Christ lives—yet we know that its life is but partially manifested in our congregations. We can and do look forward in faith and hope to its ever fuller and richer expression in those congregations, to the end that our churchmanship and our knowledge of the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord shall be one and the same in our lives and in our witness before the world.

IMPRESSIONS (II)

By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D.

Old university towns—what a distinct, though indescribable air pervades them! Know you her secret none can utter? *Alt' Marburg, wie bin ich dir gut!* Coimbra I doubt now if I shall see. But at least I have spent a week in St. Andrews. The buildings there are grey and staid. They speak of a strait and narrow way. For the Reformers it was the way of martyrdom—you should take care not to walk, we were told, where his initials keep Patrick Hamilton's name green among the cobblestones. It was vacation, and I missed the scarlet gowns; but if you tire of the grey, straight lines of Scottish houses, plumb and unbroken along the pavement, turn aside into St. Mary's College and there are all the colours of an old walled garden, its curving flower-beds tended with loving care. You might think you were in Oxford here; and it is true that the original purpose of St. Mary's was to defend Catholicism. Only, no farther away here than anywhere else in St. Andrews is the sea which, for all the freshness of its tides, is older than Oxford or even Catholicism; and it is the sea which has made St. Andrews, with its castle on the rock.

St. Andrews also has a Congregational church; though strangely, considering the importance we attribute to the local church, the Council seemed unaware of it. Its minister, the Rev. Helen Woods, B.D., J.P., who has served it for nearly twenty years, was at some of our meetings; but should not the point at which Congregationalism touches the life of St. Andrews have received some grateful recognition, if only (topsy-turvywise!) by the inclusion of Miss Woods among those who welcomed us? We were given a fine welcome by both city and University, with a skirl of bagpipes to greet us and, at the end of the week, a 'Scottish Concert', in which the music of singers and instrumentalists alike was of high quality; many of us were grieved that they were allowed to depart without a word of thanks.

Something of this apparent insensitiveness and concentration upon ourselves, to be honest, was felt to mar the Council's procedure. The handling of an assembly of 600 people has its obvious difficulties, even when all present are Christians and the vast majority share a particular Christian interpretation; but it is partly because of those difficulties that traditionally we have been shy of allowing to such assemblies a large share in the making of

decisions and have looked to something nearer the 'two or three'. If, then, it is desirable, as the Council (like other Councils) was encouraged to think, that for us, as for most other Christians, Councils should come to possess some recognized measure of authority, we must see at least a beginning in the facing and overcoming of the difficulties; and if we are to continue, as we did at St. Andrews, to repudiate the kind of authority associated with episcopal systems and Upper Houses, the task is laid on us, and we dare not decline it, of discovering and following a procedure which shall carry authority of a kind more consonant with what we believe to be the ways of the Holy Spirit.

The procedure we followed at St. Andrews was for the Council to break up into ten groups for discussion of the addresses delivered in the morning; for the groups' conclusions to be reported by a member of each group to a small body called the 'Panel'; and for two reports to be presented to the whole Council at the close of the day, by way of introducing general discussion. This can be a creative and uniting procedure, which some of us learned to value in the Student Christian Movement; but it is of little use if followed only half-heartedly. At St. Andrews the groups were provided with questions, three a morning, instead of being encouraged to discuss whatever proved of particular interest to themselves, which made for woodenness in discussion and ineffectiveness in conclusions; the evening meetings were presented with statements already drawn up, before there had been time for their contents to arise from the mind of the Council as a whole; and suggestions then made for their emendation were often not followed. In themselves the statements were, in general, good, except that they were too long; but much in them might well have been composed from the booklet prepared beforehand for the Council, *Congregational Churchmanship*, rather than from the Council.

After all, the Council was a carefully chosen gathering of responsible Christians; yet we were not expected to wrestle with a subject, toiling honestly through differences till with God's help we had reached a common mind. There was too little venturesome waiting upon God, to find what He would say to us, if indeed He had anything to say of a kind which we were able to receive—for we dared not assume that He had. The thought and labour expended by our leaders, both before and after our meetings, were indeed enormous, and we were all grateful. Possibly they were too great. In the last sentence of the booklet we had been reminded that God "loves to surprise His children". At St. Andrews there was small opening for Him to do so. The conclusions seemed to have been reached before we began. All this inevitably made for some uneasiness and dissatisfaction. The atmosphere of Christian fellow-

ship in which we met permitted such feelings to be freely expressed but was unable in itself to alter our faulty procedure. It seemed as if we all trusted each other, but did not trust the Council; did not really believe that God could (and perhaps would) speak to us, and through us, as a Council, if we would let Him.

In the document which was issued after the Council it is stated that "We believe that the mind of Christ for His people is given to Councils by the same Spirit that guides the local church". This is true; but nothing is gained by shutting our eyes to the fact that a Council is not, and cannot be, 'the same' as a local church. The people who compose a Council are met temporarily and *ad hoc*, they do not know each other and have not given themselves to one another in continuing fellowship and mutual support, they do not know their Moderator in the way they know their minister nor does he so know them; which, since for Christians the personal is normally the channel through which God makes Himself known, makes a difference that is vital and inescapable. This is not at all to deny that the mind of Christ may be discovered in Councils. It is to say, and many with whom I talked wanted it to be said, that we have yet much to do in working out, and in being faithful to, the procedure which is appropriate for Councils.

Above all, very great sensitiveness is needed: sensitiveness to the relative weight of what is said and even more of what is meant —and this is much more difficult when we have no personal knowledge of the speaker—as well as to the feeling of the meeting as a whole, as it draws towards unity: sensitiveness such as is not found at all except among Christians, and which even among ourselves is found only where there is a large degree of humility, freedom even from the wish to prejudge the issue or to force our own opinions, and willingness to allow our understanding of what we honestly took to be the common mind to be overturned. These things run clean contrary to all that is unredeemed in our human nature. God grants them to us only when we desire them so ardently that we are willing for a discipline which is both costly and continuous.

Again, if we meet in the confidence that God's Spirit is at work among us, there must be elasticity to include what is not on the programme and quickness to use gifts which did not become apparent till after the meetings began. Those whose gift is to preside over such an assembly will not necessarily be the same as those who can gather up the exercise of the meeting for expression in a written statement; while sometimes it may be right for a delegate who has spoken under a sense of burden, and whose conviction has been shared by the whole meeting, to be added to those responsible for the written statement. Such differences of ministries do but glorify the same Lord, who is at work in them all.

They also exemplify the principle that all is to be done in and through the people of God, as and while they are gathered into a single fellowship obedient to His leading. For Councils as well as for churches this principle is fundamental.

I have written mainly of procedure because I felt deeply concerned about it at the time, as I found many others did, and because I should like, if I can, to help even a little in a matter in which we are all learners, and at an elementary stage. The papers read to us were far from elementary: they demanded, and they received, the closest attention. It was interesting to notice how the Americans differ from ourselves in the way in which they present what they have to say. In particular, they depend more on rhetoric, with a reliance on repetition and the figure of speech known as anaphora, and less on the building of an argument. This, together with the differences in intonation, made them difficult sometimes for us to listen to, let alone to follow. I expect they found us difficult, too. I hope they found us as worth while.

The papers it will be possible, a little later, for all to read. But of course the main value of the meetings, which print can neither convey nor preserve, was in our Christian fellowship, which deepened into friendship as the week went on. Here, the presence of so many wives (or husbands) of delegates added much; though on the platform men were still numerically out of proportion, in the Council as a whole there was genuine partnership between the sexes as well as between nations and colours. The association of a few delegates with organized Congregationalism was somewhat tenuous, and is likely to remain so. But what a triumph for this Council of Congregationalists, and for Dr. Sidney Berry, at this point its 'onlie begetter', to have, for instance, a Liberal from the Dutch Remonstrant Brotherhood and a Conservative from the Danish Mission Covenant Churches sitting side by side, and present not (to use the current term) as 'observers' but as full delegates and welcome participants! Independency is indeed become "a uniting Principle", as the Scots Presbyterian, Robert Baillie, complained three hundred years ago, and on an international scale of which neither he nor his Independent contemporaries ever dreamed. "In the middle of life's way I found myself in a dark wood where the strait way was overgrown". "And Jonathan, Saul's son, arose and went to David into the wood, and strengthened his hand in God". At St. Andrews many a Jonathan came to many a David, and we shall always be grateful.

IMPRESSIONS (III)

By the Viscountess Stansgate

We came to St. Andrews to meet our fellow-Congregationalists from all over the world and to try, together, to "isolate and assess the value of the principle" that makes us one. With this latter end in view we had long since been provided with a great deal of preparatory home-work to do. Nobody could say that they did not know what was coming. For our first objective, that of getting to know each other, of course we needed no help. We became future old friends from the first. And, intuitively, we knew, in all our search after definitions and evaluations, that the true nature of the Congregational principle was to be found not only in hearing lectures, but, just as much, by seeing the many ways in which it had been digested into life. From the first sound of the pipes that brought us to our opening meeting (at 9.30 p.m. on a day that for many had dawned in London) right up to the last goodbye nine days later, it was this knowledge that kept the work in true perspective. All through, the fellowship brought much inspiration to the findings.

And what a rich diversity of fellowship there was! How different in our selves and in our ways of worship and church management we ourselves were from, for example, the Americans. And how even less alike our German brethren appeared to be to each other. This diversity in unity made the people a constant delight both as individuals and as groups moving within the whole community. There was our gracious Minister and Secretary, Dr. Berry, ever vigorous and youthful, to whose many and long and tireless journeyings the Council owes a debt that simply cannot be measured; our able Moderators, *regius* and *emeritus;* and among heroic missionaries, who will forget the Australian brother who had invested most of his life's savings in coming across the world to us to plead for five others to go back with him? There were the women ministers each doing a fine piece of work in widely differing circumstances. There were the friends from India, and those from South Africa who brought us first-hand news of the grievous problems with which they and their churches are wrestling. Indeed the scene at St. Andrews, full of life and colour, with *dramatis personæ* drawn from many nations and all sorts and conditions of folk, was one of which Congregationalists could be thankful and proud. It gave undimmed expression to the Apostolic teaching that there can be neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor

free, neither male nor female, for all are one in Christ Jesus.

The long and strenuous days passed quickly and wonderfully smoothly. Ten o'clock on the clear Northern evenings sometimes found us still at work or walking back to our Hall of Residence for a last cheerful gathering round the tea-trolley. And all the time there was the kindly hospitality of our hosts and the serene beauty of this University by the sea to refresh our spirits. Naturally, too, there were the jokes, both unintentional and intended. First of the latter class stood the description of that sort of organic Church Union which is offered today, as "an invitation to the lamb to lie down *inside* the lion in the hope of altering its constitution"!

But for the most part we worked. It was all too interesting to miss. The morning lectures, the afternoon 'News of the Churches', and the evening meetings and debates brought home to everyone the depth of Congregational scholarship, the richness of practical experience and the variety of talent that was there amongst us. Needless to say the *Proceedings* will have to be read and pondered long, before we of the rank and file can reach even a state of the first clarity about it all. But words spoken and questions asked come back and back to stab the imagination and haunt the memory. Dr. Schneider was able to assure us out of his own sharp personal knowledge of all forms of civil government that the Church could never be endangered by the State but only by a power that bound her internally. And the Church, he reminded us, is never free when she rules. Dr. Visser 't Hooft had two compelling quotations. The first, to call us to action, was the insistent question of Pandit Nehru to a visitor full of good ideas: "Yes—but are you DOING anything. . .?" And the second, to warn us that heads saturated with one idea can take no fruitful action on anything, was the vigorous declaration of André Siegfried: "There is only one thing worse than a Communist and that is an anti-Communist!" Then there was the heart-cry of Miss Elsie Farris, an American lawyer, separated by five strenuous years of evangelism from the beginning of her church membership: "What affects me most is the indifference of the laymen. Ninety per cent of Christians haven't been re-born!"

All the great themes for discussion were of absorbing interest but no doubt most of us felt some special concern in one or more of them. In my own case there was a tightening of the muscles whenever the matter of Reunion came up. This, I suppose, would be natural in anyone who has come home to Congregationalism after more than a generation elsewhere, who knows by contrast the meaning of a service that is perfect freedom and is jealous for its preservation. But St. Andrews proved that there is no need for

anxiety here. Dr. Cooke's forthright declaration laid the fear effectively. We had a mission within Christendom; a witness to bear among our fellow-Christians. We should not go out of existence, he promised us, until our principles had been built into the Great Church, but in working for this we worked, not for survival, but for that which would justify our death as a denomination. This conception of vocation will not be easily forgotten. It was spoken out of the heart of the Congregational *ethos*.

The last theme, that of the Church's ministry of Reconciliation, was perhaps the hardest to deal with, yet it was the one that left the deepest tracks behind it in the mind. St. Andrews gave me a deepening certainty that not only the Churches but the world need Congregational principles as never before. Here and now we have work to do that the adherents of authoritarian religion can never touch: the revitalizing of democracy by a fresh infusion of those spiritual values that gave it birth. For democracy, as we know it, arose very largely from the Congregational conception of our Christian heritage and, when dissociated from it, dwindles and diminishes. Was it not Dr. Barth who spoke to us at Amsterdam of the "exemplary importance" in the political world of today of Congregational principles expressed in the life of the Church? What a transformation there would be in our world if these could be set working not only at the national but at the international level! We might expect then to see a new toleration appearing among the nations; a recognition in deed, as well as word, of the rights of each to its own way of life; and a gracious good-will shown in unfailing readiness to work with one another; an acknowledgment that 'Foreign affairs' are really 'Family affairs'—in short the spirit of St. Andrews ruling at Lake Success! "Yes, but are we DOING anything. . . ?" On the way to the stars there are no short cuts. A conference can *work out* principles but they must be *lived out* at the level of the local church. It is from there alone that they can surge upwards to *in*form and *re*form Society.

In the years between now and the next Council we shall often think over the lectures heard and the discussions shared. But long after these have passed into the background of our minds, the devotional life of the fellowship will stand out, still, as a clear memory. We shall recall the morning prayers taken each day by a pastor from some different country; the Sunday services with their great sermons. Not least we shall remember the family prayers, when, night by night, the quiet words of our Chaplain summed up for us the day's work, turning it all into worship. From such times arose a last and deepest impression of the Council. Here was a little company gathered out of many churches that had, for these days, become itself a church.

THE MESSAGE TO THE CHURCHES

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Great Head of the Church, the Seventh International Congregational Council, meeting in St. Andrews, Scotland, June 20th—29th, 1953, sends greeting to all Christian Churches everywhere and especially those of the Congregational order.

We are deeply grateful to God for the opportunity this Council has given us of seeking His purpose for our fellowship of Churches in an hour when the vastness of the world's need calls us and Christians everywhere to place ourselves unreservedly at His disposal. In our effort to find the will of God we have often felt perplexed. Yet the hand of God has been upon us throughout, leading us through our very perplexity to a clearer discernment of the issues that most nearly concern us and, in some instances, of the practical tasks to which we must immediately address ourselves. We desire to share with you the things that have been in our minds and upon our hearts during these days of conference and ask you, in your individual churches and representative bodies, to give to them your full and prayerful consideration.

Great enrichment has come from the exchange of thought and the exploration of sometimes unfamiliar ground in our discussions Out of these discussions three strong convictions have arisen.

First, we realize that all of us need to bestir ourselves to know more about the magnitude of human need and suffering. If we are to rise to the full Christian opportunity we must be intelligent, informed and questing Churches that see and understand the maladies of our world and speak to the particular situation at the right moment with some technical competence.

Second, we have been humbled and made penitent by the discovery that we who have received so much from God have done so little to bring the Gospel and its blessings to our brothers and sisters for whom Christ died.

Third, there has been born anew in our hearts a strong concern to let God take us and use us—whatever the cost may be—to extend the sway of our Lord Jesus Christ in the world. We must act with decisiveness wherever He may call us to act, in personal life and in the Churches' internal organization, in evangelism and on the frontiers where the life of the Christian community meets and touches the life of men.

What we have experienced in our groups, in growing fellowship, in deepening insight, in liberation from self-centredness and small

views and above all in the renewal of dedication can be known wherever the two and three meet in Christ's name. We commend to all our Churches the fostering of small groups in which clear thinking and strong praying may lead out into vigorous action.

In the Council we have been engaged chiefly in reviewing the nature and the task of Congregational churchmanship. This task is necessary, both because the traditions represented in the Council differ and because the development of the ecumenical movement, especially as it is now embodied in the World Council of Churches, poses some searching questions to every Christian community. A weakness of our polity, in practice, is that it sometimes obscures the clear vision of the Great Church. Our recommendation about the place of Councils gives formal expression to a deep conviction that has been growing among us for many years. Yet we have discovered that this same polity is an earthen vessel in which God has laid a great treasure. That treasure is the understanding of the Church as constituted by the presence of Christ Himself among His people, and carries with it, as a consequence, the unequivocal recognition of all other Churches and their ministries. Based firmly on the rock of Christ's Lordship and seeking always to remain open to the enlightening and empowering action of the Living Spirit of God, Congregational churches may bear witness by the quality of their own life to the power of the Gospel. They may also remind all Churches that the true basis of organic union is a loyalty to the historic faith that leaves room for the freedom and flexibility through which alone faith can fully respond to God's continued self-giving.

Even when we were convinced that it was right to scrutinize the basis of our churchmanship we were impatient to turn from what can easily become mere self-examination to a serious grappling with the problems and opportunities that confront the Church today. The Church must constantly be moving out to redeem the world from its sin. There are numerous occasions in the day to day life of the Church, especially in our co-operation with other Christians, when God summons us to obey Him by confronting the world's needs and taking such imaginative, courageous and sacrificial action as shall make plain to our brothers outside the Church that we truly care for them, because God cares.

We have been much occupied with the world's deep divisions, in which the seeds of all human strife, including war, can be found growing. God is mightily rebuking us for our acquiescence in things that are not according to His purpose and is seeking to involve us in a more costly way in the stark plight of the modern world.

In the sections which follow we set forth the mind into which we have been led on three important issues: Congregationalism and

Councils, Congregationalism and Church Unity, Congregationalism and the World Task of the Church.

Congregationalism and Councils. Congregational Churchmanship is founded on the belief that where Christ is, there is the Church. In our history this fundamental principle has been specially expressed in the conviction that the local church is an embodiment or outcropping of the One Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. At the same time we have recognized, although not always explicitly, that the local church cannot be by itself the whole catholic Church. As part of its obedience to Christ, the Lord of the Church, every local church is committed to making actual its oneness with the wider Christian community. This fact, we consider, should be taken into serious account by all national Congregational Unions and by all churches within these Unions. This means recognizing the authority of Christ both in the individual church and in the Council (e.g., in meetings of Association, Conferences, Provincial, County, State and National Unions) to which it sends delegates. In our churchmanship the sole authority is the authority of Christ, which can be exercised only by persuasion and in the spirit of love. We believe that the mind of Christ for His people is given to Councils by the same Spirit that guides the local church. In neither of these can we claim that our interpretation of His will is infallible. In all the relationships between local churches and these Councils there is a great need on both sides of humble openness to God and of unfailing love and trust towards each other.

Congregationalism and Church Unity. We are humbly convinced that in our Congregational Churchmanship there is a principle catholicity which enables us, without any reservation, to recognize other Christians, to invite them to share in the Lord's Supper, and to receive their ministries as ordered of God. This principle has been expressed in our Congregational polity; but we gladly own that the same principle finds expression in other polities. Our polity is one of the ways in which we seek to manifest the Lordship of Christ.

We find ourselves moved by the principle which is at the heart of our tradition to seek union with other Christians. It seems plain that there are some unions into which we could enter without sacrificing our principle of catholicity. Other unions might require of us that we relinquish the practices which testfy to principles which God has entrusted to us for the whole Church. Such practices include the open invitation to the Lord's Supper, and the ordination of women to our ministry. It should be a special concern of ours to proclaim the immediate availability of divine Grace and the

responsibility of the individual Christian before God for the corporate life and obedience of the Church.

A special obligation rests on members of a United Church to maintain fellowship with members of other communions. The situations which confront the different sections of the Congregational family are diverse. Without prejudging the issue in any particular case we consider that the following should be guiding principles.

1. Two extremes are to be avoided: (*a*) a narrow denominationalism unwilling in any circumstances to unite with other communions, (*b*) a too ready acceptance of a proposed scheme of union, from considerations of expediency, divorced from principle.

2. We should be willing and eager to take the initiative in promoting union, wherever we are convinced that such union is in the purpose of God.

3. Any fellowship of Congregational Churches negotiating with another Christian communion should seek the prayers and advice of its sister Congregational Unions.

4. It is doubtful whether any union should be entered upon by Congregationalists which would on their part entail a breaking of communion with Churches with which we are at present in fellowship.

Congregationalism and the World Task of the Church. The Christ who is Head of the Church is the Saviour of all the world. In His eyes the beloved community is the whole human race. Thus the Church that is knit with Him in true union is impelled to go out to seek the lost, as He went out, and to declare His Lordship over the whole of life. The Church is gathered for worship and fellowship, which fulfil themselves in an obedience that reaches out into all the relationships of men. Fidelity to this, the Church's mission, is an indispensable mark of the true Church, local and universal.

The characteristic note of the world mission of the Church is one of reconciliation—reconciliation of races, nations, societies and individuals to the holy will of God and to His saving love in Christ. The ways in which this ministry of reconciliation need to be expressed today are manifold. They include the effort to bring home to every nation the dreadful evil of war and the wisdom of building peace upon the foundation of justice. They include service to the dispossessed and homeless—the thirty million refugees and the unnumbered millions of poverty stricken who, especially in Asia, exist in this age of plenty. They include reconciling action between the races, so that in common obedience to God and mutual respect for one another, each may fulfil the purpose of Him in whom there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, neither male nor female, but all are one.

The same ministry of reconcilation calls for responsible participation in international affairs, in political and social action, and in all that shapes and re-shapes the culture of our age. All such action requires both identification and detachment—the identification of those who are members one of another in the common body of humanity, and the detachment of those who know that in Christ they are set spiritually free in order that all other loyalties may be made subservient to Him.

The steady enlargement of the functions of the State in almost every country compels us to affirm the enduring worth of the Free Church witness. While many of us appreciate the value of State Churches (in democratic countries) in providing for the public recognition of the place of the Christian religion in national life, we maintain that this recognition can be given apart altogether from a State Church. We believe that the Free Churches can best serve the national welfare by maintaining their detachment from the State so that, while supporting and encouraging the State in all good, they may exercise the full freedom of prophetic criticism in loyalty to the Kingdom of God.

Together with all the tasks that reflect the particular crises of our time, the Church is called to minister to the perennial needs of the human heart—its need for forgiveness of sins, for peace with God, for the assurance of immortality and knowledge of the communion of saints, and for the hope of the coming of the Kingdom in which God shall sum up all things in Christ.

As the Church testifies to these things, living its creed in the unmistakable witness of a reconciled community and a caring fellowship, it is its supreme calling and delight to declare to the ends of the earth that God has visited and redeemed His people in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and that He is to be known in the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.

The task that confronts our churches, and all Christian communions, may well appal us by its immensity. When we have done our utmost in trust and dependence upon God, that utmost is still inadequate. The temptation to think that all our work is in vain is never far absent from us.

In such a situation let us rediscover in our personal experience and in the corporate life of the Church two great truths of the Christian Gospel. The first is that there are limitless resources at our disposal. The Spirit of God is in the world. There is an empowerment from on high that enables us to attempt the hardest tasks in sober confidence and even joy. The need of all of us is to keep our lives daily open to the renewing powers of grace and to maintain that alert expectancy that looks for and counts on God to act in the life of His children and of His world. The second is

that when we have done all that is within our power, God takes what we have offered to Him and uses it in ways beyond our knowing. It may not be granted to us to see the fulfilment of the work to which we have set our hands; often that work seems frustrated and even undone. But believing in the Spirit who takes up all our weak and imperfect service into His ongoing action in the world we can trustfully leave what we have done in His hands. Our labour is not in vain if it is in the Lord.

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.

For the Council: June 27th, 1953.

S. MAURICE WATTS, *Moderator.*

SIDNEY M. BERRY, *Minister and Secretary.*

The Chaplains, Officers and members of the Student Congregational Societies of Great Britain are anxious to receive information concerning young Congregationalists going up to universities this autumn.

Parents or Ministers are invited to notify the appropriate University Society so that arrangements can be made to welcome the newcomers.

OXFORD: Mr. K. B. Thompson, New College.

CAMBRIDGE: Mr. A. MacAdam, Sidney Sussex College.

LONDON: Mr. D. Sainsbury, Bentham Hall, 31-43 Cartwright Gardens, W.C.1.

LEEDS: Mr. T. Gathercole, Devonshire Hall, Headingley, Leeds 6.

MANCHESTER: Mr. D. Welbrock, Lancashire College, Whalley Range, Manchester 16.

NOTTINGHAM: The Secretary, Congregational Society, Union of Students, The University.

CARDIFF: Miss Jill Evans, 10 Archer Road, Penarth, Glam.

BRISTOL: Miss Christine George, Manor Hall, Clifton, Bristol.

EDINBURGH: Miss Pamela Gruber, 88 Morningside Drive, Edinburgh.

THE BIBLE IN THE CONTEMPORARY SITUATION

By T. W. Manson, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., D.Theol., F.B.A.

The subject puts the question to us at the outset "What is the Bible?" And there are a great many answers which could be given. The final answers of the sort that scholars can give may never be given this side of Jordan, because people are always bringing out something new. It may not necessarily be something true. If we had to wait until Biblical criticism had done its work before we could discover what the Bible essentially is, and what it is to be and do in the lives of ordinary men and women, that would be tragic. We can just give some provisional and tentative answer which will bring out the essence of the matter straight away. The essential thing about the Bible is that it is the record of God's revelation of Himself in terms of human experience. That definition will be objected to from two sides. It will be objected to by the authoritarians to whom the word 'experience' is anathema because experience in their view is something subjective or arbitrary, something that is liable to set up the thoughts of the individual against the considered judgment of the Church, or something that sets up to be a private opinion against the word of God. I want to say at once that I have no sympathy with that point of view because in the long run it leads direct to the thing we have been fighting against for a generation—the demand that the individual should submit himself, body, mind and spirit to the omni-competent State, the Totalitarian State, whether it be Nazi, Fascist or Communist. The revolt against experience is a sign of the times—totalitarian times. It pays frequent eloquent lip-service to the freedom of conscience of the individual human being, but woe betide the man or woman who dares to exercise that principle or stand upon his dignity.

On the other hand, there will be objections from the liberal side, the side that shies away from all dogma and all authority, and for that matter is very suspicious of the word 'revelation'. It is very much concerned to maintain the freedom of the individual from all credal tests, and insists that there shall be no intermediaries between man and God. Now I believe there is a real point there. I feel sure that we must maintain that the only truth that you or I can fully accept is the truth which succeeds in convincing you or me. If it does not convince me, I do not see how I can really accept it. But it is a long way from that to the further proposition that the

only truth that exists is the truth that succeeds in convincing me. That will not hold water. In the world as it is there is no dispensing with intermediaries. You cannot do without them. If you want music you will have to put up with the fact that you must either take if from Mozart of Beethoven and a few others or do without. If you decide in your own mind that nobody on earth is going to stand between you and Apollo and set to work on your own, starting from scratch with a tin whistle, I shall admire your courage but shall not envy you the result. Truth is not a static thing deposited once and for all and kept in a glass case as received. That is the tyranny of dogma. Equally it is not the latest opinion of any Tom, Dick or Harry who happens to have framed an idea and is lost in stark wonder at his own intellectual prowess. That is the tyranny of personal opinion. One comes across it from time to time. I know a good lady with whom you can argue conclusively that two and two make four. But she is equally sure that two and two make five and will tell you that she is entitled to her own opinion. There are few things in this world on which we can claim to be entitled to our own opinion. We do so at our peril; for, as I see it, truth is a living, growing organism, and has a continuous history. Since everything has to be stated in human terms, the terms of the statement are always liable to revision. But unless there is something to be stated, the whole business of revising terms becomes pointless.

The trouble with the authoritarians is that they will try to fix the form of words for ever, and the trouble with the liberals is that they will try to get everything fluid, including the solid core itself. But if there is such a thing as definite revelation and if it should happen that at certain points in history God has said something—done something—that something must be stated, however the human form in which we clothe it may be modified. We have had enough of relativity. I am tired of justice which is only what the State happens to legislate at any given moment. I believe there is another kind of justice to which States and legislators must conform, and they are not at liberty to play fast and loose with it.

The significance of the Bible, if it has any significance at all, is that it enshrines that religious reality which remains solid and unchangeable however we may change forms and words. In other words, the Bible is what it is because it contains true knowledge of a real God, and it contains that true knowledge of a real God in human terms. It presents us with a God who speaks, a God who is not just the subject of a philosophical enquiry or a piece of scientific research; not a God who sits waiting patiently until we find the right formula to describe Him; but a God who speaks, and speaks for Himself. That is an idea which the modern world finds hard to accept. The God of the Bible seems to modern man a mythical Being, not the God who takes a personal interest in the smallest

details of His world; the God who, according to Jesus, feeds the sparrows and notes the ups and downs of their several lives; who keeps an exact and regular audit of the hairs of our heads—which is much easier in some cases than in others!—the God who cares about individual men, women, and children for their own sakes. To a great many people in the modern world all that seems too good to be true. And equally He is a God who is intolerant of wickedness, who frowns upon evildoers, whose wrath can be revealed from Heaven; that to the modern mind seems too bad to be true. We are all acquainted with the late George Bernard Shaw's objection to the revelation in the Old Testament of a God who appeared to him as an irascible old gentleman. Personally I would rather have that, because it means that that God does recognize that I am there. He does treat me as a person and speak to me even if it is only to bite my head off. I would rather have that kind of God than some celestial robot, or a master calculating machine controlling the stars in their courses. But, take it or leave it, the Bible presents a God who speaks, commanding, encouraging, pleading, taking the initiative in opening the conversation with men as men.

Two questions arise. How does He speak and what does He say?

How does He speak? The answer is given in words that are the motto of Mansfield College, where once I taught the New Testament: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." The prophets and the Son. Let us look at the prophets for a moment. I think that in recent times they have perhaps been a little misunderstood. Some people have been so anxious that they should not be allowed to do anything beyond prophesying and foretelling the future that they turned them into something they were not. I want to say what the Old Testament prophets are not. They are not just knowledgeable men of affairs, who could look ahead and see which way the political or economic situation was going to develop and take the right steps accordingly for their own interest. They were not astute politicians or farseeing statesmen, or, if they were, they were something more than that. They were not just clever men who could assemble masses of information and then bring forth some brilliant diagnosis of the total situation of the country, and produce the kind of article which nowadays might be popular in *The Spectator* or *The New Statesman,* or given as a talk in the Third Programme. The prophets did not go in for that kind of thing. What the prophet says is not, "I have looked into this matter very carefully and collated all the statistics and all the evidence, and my considered conclusion is this . . . ." What he says is this, "THUS SAITH THE LORD." Incredibly, he is telling the truth. He is in God's con-

fidence, and out of his knowledge of God and of His will and His purpose he speaks to the men of his time. He declares to them what things are pleasing to God and what things are intolerable to Him, not, mark you, what things he himself approves or disapproves of, but what things God approves or disapproves of. But it is all very well to stand there and say that in a loud voice; how do we know it was not just the prophet's own fads and fancies that lie behind the claim that the Lord was speaking to him, and that what he said was in the name of God? There are three reasons which seem to me to suggest that there was something in what the prophet said. First of all, I think we can be sure that the prophets were entirely disinterested. Being a prophet in the age of prophecy was not the way of personal popularity or economic security or national fame. To be a prophet meant the taking of a great many risks; it meant great unpopularity; it meant poverty; and more often than not it meant ill-treatment. The second thing is that when studying the prophets you will find, time and again, that they did their work under a strong sense of compulsion. The prophet does not go in for prophesying because he fancies that is the kind of career that will suit him. He goes in for prophesying often against his will. Read the first chapter of Jeremiah and see how the man tries to wriggle out of being a prophet. Read later chapters of Jeremiah and see how the message is there like a consuming fire within his own personality. He cannot be silent, however much he would like to be. The truth about the Old Testament prophets is that they had to prophesy often against their own will and their desires and interests. Even when it seemed utter madness they must prophesy. But perhaps all the same it was illusion. It might be granted that prophets were honest men, that they acted under a sense of compulsion and yet, perhaps, they were self-deceived. I think there is an answer to that, too. It is when you look at the quality of what they said that it is almost impossible to believe that that kind of speech is the speech of men labouring under self-delusion. There is a quality of insight and penetration in what they say, a grasp of moral and spiritual reality that is not, I believe, compatible with the possibility that they were deluded men. We may therefore believe that God did speak by these men and that what He had to say was a matter of some moment. And what did He say?

That is the second big question. It is no accident that the Bible is full of commandments and promises. Rabbis have counted up the commandments and find 613 of them in the Law. There is a fair selection of promises. This laid down the basis for a common life to be shared by God and man, and in the working out they revealed the character of God. Let me put this in another way by saying that the commandments and promises set the terms of the

covenant between God and man. They are essentially pledges of loyalty, first that man will be loyal to God and second that God will be loyal to His people. Yes, and what is even more important than that, and more fundamental, God will be loyal to Himself.

This is the one firm basis for all the faith and hope which shine all through the Bible. Man's pledges to God get broken time and again because man is weak and foolish, proud and self-willed. The saving fact throughout the Bible is the fact that God is, and remains, loyal to Himself. He cannot deny Himself, and, because He is loyal to Himself, His people are secure. In remaining loyal to Himself through all the long travail that has produced the world of man and things as we know it, God has revealed Himself.

Revelation is more than knowledge of facts. You can have revelation only between persons, and it exists only when one person is prepared to give himself away to another. Let me try briefly to show what I think is the central thing in this revelation contained in the Bible. Here I shall say a few old-fashioned things. First Genesis, God the Creator, with immense power and infinite wisdom —that is the first great revealing act. It is true from the beginning of time until the end. The Heavens declare the glory of God, the firmament shows His handiwork. God is to be found in the things He has created. His acts reveal the power, wisdom and love of God. In the Old Testament they run in a regular series, the creation of the world in the beginning, the creation of the nation Israel, the exodus from Egypt, the re-creation of a spiritual Remnant in the exile and the return from the exile. We find Jewish faith and hope looking forward to what they hoped would be the supreme and final manifestation of God's power and glory, the utter vindication of Himself and His people, and they had a pretty shrewd idea of what form that vindication would take. It meant the overthrow of the evil and tyrannical world-empires and the creation of a new and righteous rule of the Kingdom of God with its capital in Jerusalem and Messiah on the throne. People in Palestine, the faithful and godly, were waiting eagerly for some such thing as that, and that would be the consummation of all God's acts. And it came in a form which was not expected. It came in the form of a Servant. It came in the form that Christ's Cross is the power and wisdom of God. That is to say that the supreme power is the power of love, and the supreme glory is the service itself. "He that would be great among you shall be the servant of all." We too easily assume that what this means is that if you are ambitious and try to obtain the chief place you will be punished by being made to undertake menial duties or, alternatively, that if you start off by being modest and undertaking menial service you will be rewarded by being promoted to a higher place. This is not what the saying means. It means that nobility and dignity are not the reward of service. They lie

in the service itself. If you wish to be great then you must serve, because there is no other way of being great in the Kingdom of God. Greatness is not something which follows on the service. The service itself is the dignity and glory, and there is no other. Jesus put that to His disciples very forcibly and plainly, and He did more. He put it into action Himself in life and in death. In doing that He showed man the true nature of God. Jesus of Nazareth, simply by being what He is and doing what He does, says the last word of God to us. If you want to know what the word of God really means in human terms, you must look at the ministry of Jesus Christ. In the fourth Gospel He says, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father."

The significance of the Bible in the world today is that it continues to say those things which it said from the beginning, that there is a God, and that God does speak to men and women in a way that they can understand. He speaks through the work of His hands; He speaks through His acts recorded in the history of His people; and He speaks most fully and completely in the life and work and person of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is nothing more to be added. We may, in the life of the Church, discover some of the implications of it, but in the person and work of Jesus everything that God could say to us in human terms has been said and nothing more can be said. We can discover by thought and practice the meaning of that utterance in Christ, we cannot improve or revise it. You may try to translate it into terms that our own generation can understand—well and good—but it must be translation and not free composition. That is all there is to it. I know it is very strange that the mighty power of God should be in the pierced hands of the Crucified. It is very strange that the love and knowledge of the glory of God should shine out from that bruised and bloodspattered face. It is very strange indeed, but it is true, and it is a final and inescapable truth; and our whole business is to learn it for ourselves and pass it on to the men and women of our generation.

WHAT MAKES A GOOD HYMN?

By W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., D.D.

No one can suppose that hymn singing is dying out. One of the discoveries of the B.B.C. (it has made many) is the popularity of community singing. This is the more remarkable in an age like ours, when we are being so constantly reminded that the hold of religion on the masses has long been weakening. It may be that many people still "repair to church, not for the doctrine but the music there." It may be that many people will join in "Abide with me" at Wembley, or listen to hymn singing at their fireside, when nothing would induce them to go to church for any number of hymns. But the hymn has a power which the song has not, even over those who would repudiate the suggestion. Beauty makes an appeal to us all, doubtless; but there is something which has a deeper appeal, perhaps for us all; and that is worship.

The literature on hymns increases steadily. Among the most fascinating books of the kind is the last, *Hymns and Human Life*, by Dr. Erik Routley. All the hymns which most of us know, or are likely to know, are referred to by Dr. Routley, as they were by Mr. F. J. Gillman in his *Evolution of the English Hymn* (1927). Here we find almost all that can be said about hymns which we ought, and ought not, to admire. One thing the authors are shy of discussing; why we *ought* to admire this hymn and not that; what makes a hymn 'good.'

To many this will be a pointless question. Whenever hymns are talked about and compared, the verdict comes prompt and pat; "I like this; I do not like that." If the critic is asked why he likes it, he will probably reply, after a moment's pause, "It goes with a swing," or "It touches me," or even "It brings me nearer to God;" and then, "I know what I like, and that is enough for me."

But is it really enough? Are we thus imprisoned within our own preferences? Is it impossible to find grounds on which to defend them? Surely, there must be some reason, whether we are aware of it or not, why we 'like' Faber or Watts, Torrey-Alexander or Keble. Surely, too (and here we touch the purpose of this paper) a 'good hymn' is more than 'a hymn I happen to like.' If I like *this* hymn, I am content that you should like *that*; if I say 'This hymn is good,' I mean that it ought to be liked, or sung, by both of us, and by everyone else.

We can at least travel towards an answer. It may be dangerous

to begin with a definition of a hymn, good and bad; but we can agree that a hymn is something that we sing together in worship. It does not consist of words, even of religious words, that have been set to music, like *The Creation,* or *The Dream of Gerontius*. It is made up of words which we sing together and to God; and a hymn will be good in so far as it enables us to do this satisfactorily. Properly speaking, it has nothing to do with our likes and dislikes. We sing it for the glory of God; and it is what God thinks about the hymn, or the singers, that matters.

Worship is a term which is at once venerable, comprehensive, and vague. But it covers three things; prayer, penitence, and praise. Some hymns, it is true, read like exhortations to the singers themselves, or to others, to pray, or confess their sins, or to praise; as for example, "Prayer is the soul's sincere desire", or "Come my soul, thy suit prepare". Yet we are at least on the way, while we sing them, to the house of the Lord; and we hope that the others will join us. God is still the journey's end.

"But," asks the individualist within us, "do we not travel by different roads? The blessings implored are as diverse as the sins to be forgiven;" and, we may add, as the language and the music which the worshippers happen to prefer. This is a difficulty only when we forget that singing hymns means singing them together. We have to use the same words and the same music. It is a common language and a common melody that make the hymn. We are not like the ignorant Corinthian Christians, bringing our own lunch to the Lord's Table, and eating it in our own corner. We share the bread and wine of our devotion together. We leave our favourite little song-books behind. It is—indeed it must be—common prayer and common praise, that are offered to the common Lord.

We learn of one another. We bear and forbear. We are like limbs and organs in the same body. What helps my brother in making his way to the Lord's side, helps me. Out in the street, I might not admire the cut of his coat. I might congratulate myself that I go to a different tailor. But when, within the sacred walls, I see the wedding garment which the Master of the feast has given him, who am I that I should shrug my contemptuous shoulders? If he rejoices to sing "Count your blessings" while I long for Addison's "When all Thy mercies, O my God," the sentiment is the same. Is Addison's the only language understood in the heavenly courts? Or I may lift up my own soul in "Trust and obey." But my attitude is exactly that of "Leave God to order all thy ways." We both mean the same thing; and we shall each understand better what we think we are singing if we also hear it, and sing it, in the other's words.

There is no part of life where it is more fatal to "eat our morsel

alone'' than in worship. On the other hand, there is nothing which opens more widely the door of worship than to exchange the attitude of ''I prefer this'' to ''God evidently accepts that.'' He who whispers ''nor even as this publican'' will always find the door shut in his face. In all true worship the first person singular dies away on our lips. I do not enter into His gates merely to confess my own sins, or ask for my own needs. Whatever may be said of religion, worship is emphatically not ''what I do with my own solitariness.'' God knows I have enough ground for grief and shame of my own. But when I enter into that of others, I make the surprising discovery that, if I bear their burdens as well as my own, the whole load is lightened, and ''we all partake the joy of one.''

Common worship thus lifts us above the individual differences of likes and preferences. And it does far more. It smoothes out the differences of mood and temperament. In any company of worshippers we may expect some who will be exulting in the Lord; while others can but whisper ''out of the depths.'' Joy and gloom, confidence and fear, conflict and conquest, must all find and use the same language. Is this possible? It is not, if the worshipper is conscious only of his own blessings or griefs. But it is when that consciousness ends that true worship begins. We are members one of another; of the body in which each comes to feel the pain or ease of all the rest, and where the experience of every organ becomes the experience of the head. When the worshippers are thus invaded by the mind of Christ, the pilgrim struggling through the Slough of Despond may be lost in wonder, love and praise; and his brother, nearing the gates of the Celestial City, will feel himself by the side of those who walk through the perils of Vanity Fair.

In all human worship there are baser as well as nobler elements. Every reader of the Psalms knows this. But Gresham's Law does not always hold good. When the soul longs and thirsts to draw near to God, and heaven itself comes down to greet it, the cheap and tawdry will fade away, as the human voice will often show an unlooked-for refinement in prayer and praise; and the highbrow and the 'arty' will disappear. When we find ourselves in the flock of God, the idiosyncracies that distract us, whether learnt from Philipp Bliss or from Holst and Beer, become unimportant.

So much for what we may call the impertinence of the individualist. That is good which leads me and my brother to God, as we worship together. And unless we have learnt to think of ourselves thus as brothers, we shall never move a step forward. But what can we expect to lead us thus to God? If we admit that we cannot and dare not say ''I like this, therefore you ought to like it too'', what is it that will assist our common worship? Every

worshipper must learn to respect his fellow-worshipper. He has everything to gain thereby; and everything to lose if he fails. But worship is not a mechanical mixture of preferences, a kind of heap of sand and sugar. We do not speak in a medley or hubbub of tongues. The tongues must be fused into the language of Zion, where no interpreter is needed. What are the essentials of this common language of prayer, of confession, and of praise?

Here we may turn again with advantage to Dr. Routley's book, and especially to the last chapters. There he gives lists of hymns both used on great national occasions, and in various churches on the same Sunday. These may be taken as hymns that have made their way to the heart, not only of pious or instructed individuals, but of the whole religious community. An examination of these should surely reveal what it is that makes people 'like' a hymn or think it 'good'. But what a task! Doubtless they, or many of them, are hymns which men will not willingly allow to die—a very serviceable test of excellence, whether of words or tunes. But we shall make the best use of such lists if we try and construct a canon of our own, and then test it by the hymns which have themselves stood the test of time.

Such a test must be a double one, since the hymn itself has two aspects, words and music. The distinction between the two is often forgotten. Many a feeble set of words drifts into popularity because it has had the good fortune to be associated with a catching tune. Some tunes there are which seem able to fit any words; while verses which shine with the light of devotion, failing an appropriate tune, miss recognition as material for a good hymn: just as a noble act or career, as the Roman poet said, misses the immortality it deserves if it finds no bard to sing its praise. A good hymn means a good tune joined to good words.

Let us begin by considering the good tune. "Some of the attributes of a good tune" (I quote from Percy Scholes's *Oxford Companion to Music*) "are economy and logic in the use of materials; avoidance of any cheapening of the climax note; sufficient, but not too much variety, and so forth. But whether by the compilation of a list of such attributes one could put the student in the way of composing tunes infallibly good is a different matter" —or of judging them. "In recent years," it has been said, "the real question of what is a good hymn has been burked in favour of the unreal one of what is the best hymn-book."

The first thing to remember is that a hymn-tune is, as all music originally was, intended to be sung by a group. It must therefore be easily caught and remembered. "Melody," said Walford Davies, "is the language of a mind that is both orderly and at liberty." The phrases and the intervals must be short; and the

more notes there are in simple sequence, the better—very much of a b c d e, and very little of a-e, b-f. There must be rhythm; the tune must set us wanting to dance or to march; it must *move* us in a double sense. And every good tune will have structure; a brave top note will be there to hold the whole tune together. There may be, as Kipling said, "nine and sixty ways of constructing tribal lays, and every single one of them" may be "right;" but, consciously or unconsciously, they obey these rules, whatever the aesthete may say. Who would not be proud of composing such tunes as "God save the Queen," or "The British Grenadiers," or the "Old Hundredth," "Sumer is icumen in," "Greensleeves," or the immortal tune at the end of Beethoven's ninth Symphony, where nearly all the notes are consecutive? How simple they are, yet what vitality there is in them all! They sing themselves, as if they were moulded on one pattern, and obeyed one master.

One thing is clear; a good hymn tune will be a good tune. It can be nothing less; but it must be something more. It must move us in a certain way. The emotions it rouses must

> Dissolve our soul in ecstasies
> And bring all heaven before our eyes.

Grief, as in "Rockingham;" but grief as sent or permitted by God; the very opposite of despair. Triumph, as in "Gopsal" but not triumph over foes I have conquered, but the Saviour's triumph over the evil things in me. There is no reason why the best tunes ever composed, like "Austria" or the "Londonderry Air," should not lift our hearts in worship. But in the house of God there can be no place for rollicking or ostentation or pride or mere cleverness, or the ribaldry that will suggest either the golden calf or the den of thieves. It is the worshipper's own heart which instructs him. And even when our voices join with angels and archangels, there will come a time when praise must sit silent on our tongues.

Tunes are thus both restricted and elevated by being intended for common use in the house of God. So with the words. If words are to be sung by a number of people, they must have the structure and rhythm of poetry; and since the singers are a congregation and not a trained choir, the poetry must be arranged in verse; verse, which like the language of a ballad or a folk-song must be readily caught and understood. But the hymn is not a ballad, like *Horatius* or the *Ballad of Chevy Chase*. It is a lyric. It is a brief, and it should be a poignant expression of an emotion; an emotion which can be felt by all the singers, like "How happy is he born and taught," or "Fear no more the heat o' the sun," rather than "To Lucasta on Going to the Wars." Most hymn singers are ashamed of doggerel; few agree as to what is doggerel and what is

not. But since the words, like the tune, of a hymn are what we are bold enough to ask God to listen to, the emotions they express must wear, so to speak, their Sunday clothes.

How many were the emotions that swept across the mind of Jesus during His ministry!—the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn, the love of love. We bring our emotions, like our gifts, to the altar. But that altar is the mean altar of our hearts. On that altar falls the heavenly flame that purges, transforms, sanctifies, till it radiates His glory. Whatever the emotion, of saint or sinner, it is purified by "the mystic joys of penitence," and it rises to heaven in a cloud of praise. Some heights doubtless must be climbed by the adventurer alone. But it is for the feet of a company that the rough places are made smooth and the crooked ways straight.

Here, however, we need to pause. The tune, we agree, must be simple; but the words? Surely there is a depth in the devotion of a saint, whether he descends to the dark night of the soul, or climbs the height of Carmel, which it would be useless and wrong to expect in the little children and the young men. Can all sing the battle with Apollyon or the rapture of the Delectable Mountains? Those who are fond of comparing Watts and Wesley will understand the problem. As a hymn writer, Watts has in mind the normal congregation of the "gathered church," as in "Our God, our help"; "When I survey"; "There is a land of pure delight." There is nothing in any of his great hymns in which every worshipper would not wish to join. Hence their strength, their popularity, their influence. Charles Wesley pushed his way farther into the intimacies of the religious life. "Jesu lover of my soul"; "How can a sinner know his sins on earth forgiven?" This was because he wrote deliberately for the élite as well as for the multitude. But by so doing he helped to bring many of the multitude into the company of the élite. There is a highest common factor in hymn singing as well as a lowest common denominator.

The community which can make full use of a particular hymn may be larger or smaller; and composed in the main of those who are more or who are less at ease in Zion. But for all hymns there are certain essentials. These are not to be learnt from musical or literary cliques, nor even from ecclesiastical sects. They must be catholic, in the true sense of the word. They must appeal, like the lyric or, if we may go back to Elizabethan days, the madrigal, to the general rather than the specific in our nature. If they are written for the few rather than the many, it is in the hope that the many will come to appreciate what at first delights only the few. The one sin that damns the hymn is the comment of the singer, "if others do not like this, so much the worse for them."

Hence the technique of the hymn, as we may call it, both in

words and tune. "Simple, sensuous and sincere"; even if he who begins by singing of "sweet fields beyond the swelling flood" ends with "those amarynthine bowers inalienably ours." But the technique of the hymn, this common approach with voice and heart to the things of God, involves something more. It will conform to a pattern "seen in the Mount." Here we must tread with caution. A heavenly pattern for the tabernacle we can understand; but for the psalm of the singers there? Yet if we may think of a pattern laid up by the Creator for any and every human activity, surely we may think of a pattern for these songs of ascents. If the heavenly Architect designed not only the temple but also the way to it, He cannot regard as beneath His notice the songs on our lips, whether we are on the road or pass within its gates.

We may go further. Every artist knows that the best part of his work is given to him. The idea may flash upon him, as we are told it would do to Mozart; or it may need much meditation and change, as in the reveries of Beethoven. The artist must learn to wait, and observe with the inner eye. "What do we do, Catharine," asked William Blake, "when the vision does not come?" "We kneel down and pray, Mr. Blake," was the answer. But the pattern, for which the artist searches heaven, or his own soul, is not simply the vision of some particular composition; it is the pattern of all beauty; we might speak of it, following Plato, as the "form" of beauty; those qualities of strength, order, rhythm, balance, rest in movement and movement in rest, which reveal themselves first to the unconscious and then to the conscious mind of every reverent beholder; in the Elgin marbles, the Sistine Madonna, the Virgin of the Rocks, a chorus of Euripides, as in the crude, yet strangely satisfying, paintings of the Altamira caves.

The pattern implies a pattern-maker. There is no more chance or luck about our pleasure in such a discovery than there is in the movement of an athlete's muscle or in the millions of co-operating cells in the brain of a philosopher. "I have been thinking," said Kepler the astronomer, "the thoughts of God." Every lover of beauty, whether it is his to "make," like the poet, or only to contemplate, knows in his heart that he is approaching what has been fashioned by God. He is drawn into an interplay, a sort of *santa conversazione,* between himself and God. God advances; he responds; and to his response, God replies. He is on the borders of the realm of the spirit.

Yet how little, it may be, does the artist understand of what is taking place. To compare with some masterpiece of his a simple hymn, sung in a wayside sanctuary, is not absurd. Far from it. For the worshippers, though their voices may quaver and the melody may go limpingly, know whom they have believed. *Lex*

credendi, so runs the maxim, *lex orandi,* or vice versa. The essence of prayer is the essence of belief. It is more to the point here to equate the *lex orandi* and the *lex cantandi.* At the heart of every hymn—words and tune—which deserves to be called 'good' or to be allowed to live lies the combination of qualities, simplicity, order, harmony of intent and action, with the added element of reverence, which is conscious of God, moves to God, and is gathered into God.

Here, the design and movement are felt and known as God's. He first inspires and then accepts our song. No one, indeed, can set limits to the experience of the solitary worshipper whose quiet spirit is bidden to hear the comfortable voice. But when prayer, penitence and praise (to name that gracious triad once more) take shape according to the laws which must be obeyed if men and women together are to follow in their footsteps, angels and men are joined; God Himself is at the centre of our devotion, and what we 'like' passes into what He blesses and completes.

It was much more than a happy invention that led Dante to describe the activity of Paradise, in every sphere, as music; song and speech combined into what he called a dance, the circular rhythmic motion, always at rest, always advancing, both in light and joy. Milton is equally sure. That song was heard long ago,

> till disproportioned sin
> Jarred against nature's chime, and with harsh din
> Broke the fair music which all creatures made
> To their great Lord;

but it is not lost. Surely God will ere long

> To His celestial consort us unite
> To live with Him and sing in endless morn of light.

* * * *

"All this," sighs the weary reader perhaps, "about a parcel of hymns; as if anyone could change the fact that what I like, I like." But likings can be changed. That is their weakness and their strength. To think of the hymn as God's workmanship, built on the pattern framed for His delight, dowers it with unexpected beauty; reveals, as with a touch of Ithuriel's spear, the meritorious and the shoddy, and sets us magnifying the Lord together; till we catch, as if listening to the horns of Elfland faintly blowing, the music of the bright seraphim as they blow on their high-uplifted angel trumpets.

HOMER AND THE ILIAD

By A. G. Matthews, M.A.

Tradition attributes to Homer two poems, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The later poem, the *Odyssey*, is in many respects markedly different from the earlier, so much so that perhaps the majority of Homeric scholars today veto the possibility of both poems being the work of the same author. I am here confining to the *Iliad* the random and impressionistic remarks which follow, with a lively misgiving lest my zeal should be too transparently without knowledge on so vast a subject, and one to which countless classical scholars, of every degree of eminence, have devoted countless years of erudite and expert study. And yet, if ours really is the age of the common man, and not primarily of the expert, that supports the case for an open *Iliad*, like the open Bible, a book for the expertise of the clerisy, but also a book for the laity, and admitting of a layman's comment.

The *Iliad*, being an epic, is a narrative poem, for the epic is the age-long art of the story-teller risen to its meridian height. To all lesser forms of the narrative poem it stands superior as having for its theme not the common life of the common man but the glorious doings and the glorious dyings of wondrous heroes, the supermen of a golden age, which for Homer lay away back some two and three centuries before his time. In the *Iliad* the scene of these achievements is the city of Troy, or Ilium (Homer uses both names indifferently) which the Greeks (Achaians is his name for them) besieged for ten years. From all that long story Homer selects a single episode only, occurring late in the war, the core of which for time falls within a week or less, and for its page-space takes up six books of the twenty-four, or something like 5,000 lines of the total 15,700. The rest of the poem is a setting for it, or the sweep of a wide circuit converging upon it. The dominating figure in the culmination of the drama is Achilles, a hero larger than life, attired in heaven-made armour, and yet tragically doomed to an early death. The story opens on his quarrel with his commander-in-chief on a point of honour, and his withdrawal to his tent. Then at long length he takes the field again burning with rage to avenge the death of the one being on earth he really loves, his comrade who went forth to fight without him and fell in the fray. The Trojans are soon to learn the difference now that Achilles is once more in the field. Such in briefest summary is the story.

And now about Homer himself. *Magni nominis umbra;* visibility is practically nil. We cannot even decide his century. Suppose we put him in the 9th B.C. Then he might be contemporary with Ahab, Jezebel and Elijah. On the day when the prophet enacted his stupendous piece of melodrama with the Baalists on Mount Carmel, Homer was not far away "making great verse unto his little clan." Or put him into the next century, then he might be the contemporary of Isaiah. "In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord." Homer might have cause to say of that year "I heard the Muse," and she was to him not a mere figure of speech. A poet of his date and conditions knew himself as commissioned by, taught by, under the protection of a divine being, a patron saint of larger scale.

And in passing let us note that when we set "Thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece" we thrust a finger into one of the gaping seams in our humanity's garment. The controversy of Hebraism versus Hellenism appealed to our fathers and grandfathers more than to us. They ruminated over it, brought it into their sermons maybe, after reading what Matthew Arnold and other men of culture had to say about it. Whether we talk about it or not, there the rent is, and our world would be another world without it.

When we shift from the quicksands of Homer's chronology to locate him geographically we are comparatively on *terra firma.* We can confidently place him in Ionia, and that is a coastal strip of South West Asia Minor, in square-mileage much the same as one of our larger counties. Among its cities were Ephesus and Smyrna, names which rouse New Testament reminiscences, and it included the two islands of Samos and Chios, the latter of which has traditional associations with Homer of considerable verisimilitude. By race the Ionians were Greeks whose forefathers had fled from Greece Proper before an inroad of hostile invaders. Has anyone anything else to declare about Homer? Nothing.

After 400 years we know very little about Shakespeare the man. The certainties concerning him can be put down on a single sheet of paper, a small one at that. After the same length of time the Greeks knew even less about Homer. They told some traditional stories of him, but they had nothing factual to relate. Nor has subsequent research brought to light anything to make us in this respect any wiser than they were. Tradition declares him to have been the author of the *Iliad,* but that has no confirmation in the poem itself, for his name does not once occur in its whole extent. Nor is there anything in it that can on any reasonable conjecture be taken for autobiography. Contrast our own great epic where the most often quoted and most moving lines of it all are those in which Milton speaks of his blindness. Homer never approaches to

that degree of intimacy. He is wrapped in a bardic cloak of impenetrable impersonality. We may say, without reflection on Milton, his work is "seraphically free from taint of personality." Perhaps he put his own opinions and judgments, his own likes and dislikes, into the mouths of his characters, perhaps he does not, sometimes but not always, and as to which are which he leaves us guessing. The man himself in magnificently objective fashion is merged in the telling of his story. And yet we cannot but be aware that there is Someone behind the veil, an august presence, like Wisdom, strongly and serenely ordering all things; a mind and imagination, which with a poet are one, pre-eminently masculine, balanced, sane. Already in Homer there are the qualities which were to characterise the Greek genius of later times, the μηδὲν ἄγαν (nothing to excess), the σωφροσύνη, which St. Paul joins with "power and love" as a gift from God, and which our Bible translates "a sound mind."

And then there is his divine lucidity. His thought is always noonday clear. Even as schoolboys, those of us who studied Greek were from our standpoint aware, in addition to other charms, that Homer possessed this attractive superiority over some other Greek authors whom we found grievously hard to unravel. Some of Homer's clarity we may attribute to the conditions of his public production. His was a spoken word to be heard, not a written word to be read. And while a writer may take liberties with his readers, knowing that re-reading is always possible, no speaker who knows his business, and plays fair, takes liberties with his hearers, when re-hearing is not in the contract and when hit or miss is the rule of the game. Sentences therefore must be simple, syntax not involved. Homer's is not. Clause is tacked on to clause, much as in the narrative portions of the Old Testament. Delivery, whatever form it took, must have been slower than ours. The folk of Homer's little world, except when they were on the battlefield or the race-course, were not bamboozled with the delusion that quickness is all. And, from another angle, we have to note that the *Iliad,* being a narrative poem, moves in the region of the concrete, which in itself is again conducive to clarity. Dante might be drawn to weave portions of St. Thomas's *Summa* into the fabric of his *Divina Commedia,* Homer was under no equivalent temptation; not for him the intricacies and complexities of abstract thought. Yet, when all this is said, what is more significant is the lucidity in the soul of the man. "I hate the world for its mystery," was the outburst of a later Greek. We cannot think of Homer speaking thus about ultimate things. He was too wise, too heroically calm in face of man's dark and dubious lot. But, at a lower level, where mystery may on closer inspection prove to be akin to muddle, there Homer's

hatred must have been annihilating. What he did with matters he could not say clearly we do not know, except that he did not say them. But when this is granted we must enter a caveat. For all Homer's lucidity of narration it would be idle to suppose that we as readers can hear the *Iliad* as his first listeners did. The story cannot mean to us what it meant to them. We can sense the *élan* and the music of his hexameters, but we cannot exult in them as they must have done. We cannot be sure of catching the subtler suggestions and associations of his words, nor recover his feel of common things and common experiences. All that is difficult enough when we are reading one of our own great poets, and far more difficult when we are studying a poem of another race and a remote age; one too, which, we may hazard the opinion, is not so susceptible of translation as the Hebrew literature. The *Iliad* has never had, and now can never have, a translation comparable to our *Authorized Version* of Holy Scripture. Yet the amazing fact remains that Homer's commanding voice still retains its power to hold us in awed delight. A reader need not be a person of any exceptional poetic sensibility to feel that that is so. Only a supreme vitality of genius could thus set at nought all the interferences that time and space have thrown in its way.

Whatever date we give it the *Iliad* is our earliest poem; not only the earliest Greek poem, but the earliest European poem. In the beginning was the best. How extraordinary that is! Imagine yourself listening back across the centuries to catch, as you suppose, the earliest strain of half-awakened song. Something quite primitive, unsophisticated, something like a tune executed on a whistle, such as in Victorian days was priced at a penny, is what you anticipate, whereas the bewildering fact is that you hear an unsurpassed and unsurpassable burst of the grandest organ music. A sheer miracle, you might exclaim. As if at that date in the world's history God said, Let there be poetry: and Homer was. That was pretty much the way people in past days read the situation. But we moderns have grown more chary about accepting miracles. Even Homer, we reason, was but man, subject to like conditions as the rest of men, and these preclude such suddenness as this. We have, therefore, to postulate that on some undiscovered and undiscoverable spot on Greek soil there is a monument to certain unknown Greek bards with the inscription, 'But for us, Homer had not been.' These nameless craftsmen, we assume, did the preparatory spade work, carried through the experimental stages of epic construction, made the mistakes and corrected them, replaced the good with a better, shaped the stories, framed the canon of appropriate poetic diction, and also beat out the metre, the hexameter, 'stateliest

measure ever moulded by the lips of man,' as Tennyson said of its Virgilian counterpart.

It is tempting, but impossible, to linger over this equipment which Homer found to his hand. Suffice it to note that the most precious item of its content was the language. Obviously a poet must have a language, one adequate to his requirements, if he is to body forth his imaginings to his heart's satisfaction. Without it, he is no better, maybe worse off, than a composer without an orchestra. Where were even Homer without Greek, by common admission the most perfect vehicle of speech the world has ever known. But earlier bards used this Greek, and we may fancy them to resemble an organist seated at a full-scale organ but only able to play on some small part of it. Homer played the whole organ, exploiting all its resources, all its stops. Be that as it may, we have further to remark about his language that it is a poetic form of diction. The Ionians could never have talked it in daily life. Its epithets are perhaps its most striking feature. Take the illustration most often quoted, the epithets he gives to Dawn, personified as a goddess. She is 'the golden-throned,' 'the saffron-robed,' 'the rosy-fingered' (in the *Odyssey*). And there, to follow up this particular example, it is noteworthy that it is the day's first light that most stirs Homer's imagination, a preference which centuries later Shakespeare appears to have had. And if Homer's kindlings fascinate us, his coolnesses and silences also have their suggestiveness and their surprises. Thus if we turn from the Dawn and think to hear some good thing about sunset which, our habits being what they are, receives more of our aesthetic attention than the sunrise, we meet with a disappointment. He has left it unpersonified and without verbal embroidery. 'The sun sank and all the highways were darkened' is his customary line for dismissing the daylight. It reads almost as if he looked with 'a cold disliking eye' upon this interference with man's activities, for which the splendours of the western sky offered no sort of compensation worth mentioning. So that we are half inclined to query, 'Is Homer also among the utilitarians?' It is a strain that had its part in the Greek make-up. And yet the *Iliad* has another line for the close of day, one of disarming beauty, 'Night is come; it is well for us to yield obedience to Night.'

And now let us cast our eye over the Homeric battle scene, a panorama to the eye, a pandemonium to the ear. The stage is a crowded one, thronged with human figures, tumultuous with human action, and, too, 'full of speech and intertwisting tales,' loud with human shouts, and prayers and groans, echoing with the furious hubbub of the fight, though that, in our eyes, is belittled to a mere war of chariots, of spear and shield, and other such hand artillery.

And behind the lines there are scenes of another sort, touching domestic scenes, some of them, and up in heaven are staged the strange goings-on of the unaccountable gods. From all this there stand out in high relief the Heroes of the strife, individualized, acting and speaking in sustained differentiation of character. They are the *élite* of the Homeric *dramatis personae,* who redeem the commonplace world from its mediocrity.

Let us study one of them for a moment. 'Forward, let us on, whether it be that we are to give glory to other men, or they are to give it to us.' So runs the famous line of quintessential heroism with which a hero calls on his comrade to enter the mortal combat. And what a pregnant line it is! The enemy set first with the possibility of the speaker's downfall; the suggestion that it is all one whose is the glory, only let there be glory. And beyond the mere words (only eight in the original and two of them bare particles) we may glimpse, could we but unfold it, a whole world of high hearted adventure and desperate resolution. Literature, like life itself, if we have grace to see it so, has a colour and a meaning beyond anything that light and hurried thoughts can hit on. And this glory will live and be quickened not by the precarious and informal talk of ordinary men, but in the deathless songs of the poets, for they hold the keys of the House of Fame. And if they will it, then, to re-write the psalmist, the hero shall be had in everlasting remembrance. That is the hero's nearest approximation to eternal life. As to any other hereafter, it is all one how you write it, Sheol, Hades, Avernus, the same twilight half-life, the same phoney underworld.

Such is Homer's happy warrior, his happy Hero. The word is the ace of Homeric speech, the richest of all his 'rich single words,' his supreme verbal contribution to the European tongue. He has emblazoned it in the human imagination, and, as Napoleon said, imagination rules the world. He has set it in our linguistic firmament to become, beyond his knowing, not a fixed star but a point of light ever gathering unto itself more light. For Homer, Heroism is confined to the battlefield, and also it is for men only. In the *Iliad* no Jael disposes of a Sisera; there is no female figure of strength; no woman of affairs and of action, the brains of an army and their poet, such as was Deborah. Homer's women (Helen, his subtlest piece of characterization, whose fabulous beauty he has fastened for ever in the world's imagination; the two women of the Trojan royal house, the mother of Hector and his wife; the more slightly outlined images of the captive women in the Greek camp) are figures of pathos infinitely moving but, as we might think, all too much burdening their lords and masters with their tears, when, however desperate the odds, they should be heartening and uphold-

ing them. Homer does not see it that way. Men must fight and women must weep: such is his vision of life in wartime. But it is not ours. In this and other directions there has been a development of heroic doctrine, as there has been of Christian doctrine. If we look strictly at the letter of the matter we shall find there are non-subscribers to 'Hero' and very eminent ones. Mallory prefers to speak of Knights. The Bible knows nothing of heroes as such, David's 'mighty men' or any other. Shakespeare knows little of it. On St. Crispin's eve 'we few, we happy few, we band of brothers' are not in the letter called to be heroes. Not that it matters; heroism is as high heroical under whatever name it goes. All the same, when today we want a word for the golden deed we are, wittingly or unwittingly, faithful to the *Iliad*. A hero, we say, and to the imaginative ear the word comes echoing across 'the dark backward and abysm of time' from some morning, even a morning without clouds, when the sun rose upon an unlocated Ionian festival and Homer, magnificent in his bardic array, for the first time intoned his mighty epic concerning the wrath of Achilles, the son of Peleus.

Next, to consider the poet's audience. If we are not prepared to accept Homer as sheer miracle, we must reason the same way about his hearers. They could not one day have been primitives and the next day have stepped up to the level of intelligence and culture that an appreciation of the *Iliad* implies. Those earlier bards must have done some educational work with them, and with their fathers and grandfathers. Not that that presented any serious difficulties, for they must have been a highly sensitive, receptive, educable people, under conditions which favoured that particular sort of education. We cannot at all easily transport ourselves back into a state of society, a civilized one too, where the sole medium of dissemination was the spoken word, where all literature took the form of poetry, and where in consequence the only men of letters were the poets. With us, poets are not in the forefront of our national scene, not for that matter as much as they were in Victorian days, and even then poetry appealed only to a minority; it was, and is, in the nature of a side-show. In contrast to which, in Ionia the poets were at the very centre of the life of the community, and their works were the common interest of citizens, each and all. And this common interest must have been given some corporate expression, have been embodied in some form of festival celebrations. There appear to have been such in the smaller groupings of villages and townships. But there appears to have been also something more comprehensive, something in the nature of an Eisteddfod, held yearly or at longer intervals, and drawing its attendance from a wide area of cities and townships. And there the impresario had

on his programme along with minor items, a *pièce de résistance,* a long poem, the *Iliad,* the recitation of which might be spread over three days, so a leading Homeric scholar has recently suggested.

To take another look at the audience in the endeavour to see a little further into their minds. We must suppose them to be people not only possessed of a considerable degree of intellectual enlightenment but also of moral and spiritual enlightenment. In illustration, let us look at two examples of this, two superiorities, the one to class distinctions, the other to nationalist truculence. I cannot do more than mention the first. It is implied, as it seems to me, in the similes, which every reader of the *Iliad* finds its readiest and most immediate sources of delight. Homer's society was certainly a graded one of ranks and stations. Yet here in the small vignettes, scattered through his work with much of the effect of the illuminations in a medieval service book, he introduces the figures of working men and women as they were to be seen by his hearers any day in Ionian town or country. And that he does quite unceremoniously. There is no slightest hint of apology for speaking of mighty warriors being like herdsmen or woodcutters, nor a hint of sentimentalism or jocularity about them. Homer simply sets them there, objectively, characters in that other drama of peaceful pursuits where all and sundry help to spin the great wheel of earth about.

And, next, Homer is singularly free from all national or racial prejudice. At a later date the Greeks were to advertise their haughty sense of their own superiority by calling the rest of men barbarians, as the Jews proclaimed their sense of their religious superiority by calling the rest of the world heathen. There is a stray remark or two in the *Iliad* about the noisy and uncouth tongues of some of the foreign soldiers serving with the Trojans, but probably no one would have taken notice of them unless he had known beforehand what they portended. These are but dust spots in the sun. It is much more true to say of Homer that he is wholly free from racial contempts and animosities. He is not of those who require the stimulus of hatred, of being against some other party or nation before he can get his inner fires warmed up. Nor is he of those who play upon any bitter memories or national rancours that may be in the minds of his hearers by singing to them hymns of hate or imprecatory psalms. And that becomes all the more striking when we recall that he is narrating the history, as he and his listeners take it to be, of a war in which his and their ancestors were matched against another people. About a war the majority of men are partisans. Not so Homer: he is impartial. Oh, you exclaim, the impartial historian is the dullest of dullards. Then you have yet to

learn that persons alter cases, to learn what impartiality can be in the hands of a master of impartiality, who, when he picks up the smoking flax, kindles it to a dazzling splendour.

Lord Acton, in a famous lecture to a Cambridge audience, said that as a discipline in historical thinking we should make out a stronger case for our opponents than they can make for themselves. Great Homer nods assent. It is a point he made to an Ionian audience when delivering his *Iliad* some years before. Perhaps it would be nearer the truth to say that he assumed the point and had no difficulty in carrying his audience with him. The plain fact is that he put his imagination so liberally at the service of Hector that he encourages you to believe, what probably you wish to believe, that Homer himself had more admiration and affection for Hector, the Trojan, than for Achilles, the Achaian. He has in the battle scenes thrown the courage of the Trojans into such high relief that you are left wondering what reason he could have had for laying himself open to the suspicion that he was more against his own people than for them. In solemn fact he has left the world with the impression that, though they lost the war, the Trojans were the braver men, for whereas your friend would not thank you for telling him he was a perfect Achaian, were you to call him a positive Trojan it is quite possible, even in these days of classical decline, that he would appreciate your meaning. To us moderns this high impartiality, this superiority to national and racial prejudice, however Homer arrived at it, cannot but appeal. We know how vital its preservation is for the sanity and decency of the world's life. And we know only too well how partiality, under the name of propaganda, has put a more aggressive edge on its axe and acquired an all too effective technique. And if this high-minded outlook is but precariously represented in our modern world, it was not, for anything we can make out, represented at all in Homer's contemporaries. Even those of us who are not as well up in our Bibles as we ought to be feel quite safe in saying there is nothing of the sort in the Old Testament. We can answer for it that the men of letters J and E, D and P, make no expeditions of sympathetic imagination to the other side of the battlefield when Israel is engaged in one of its interminable wars with Moab, Edom, Philistia and the rest of them. As to Elijah on Mount Carmel, a modern has, I think, ventilated the suggestion that the story might be re-told from the standpoint of the prophets of Baal. But that is, obviously, an ultra-modern and wholly unbiblical proposal.

If then we are back at that always fascinating, and always insoluble, enigma of "Thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece," then anyone who talks sense about it will have to reckon with the one solid and indisputable fact—the Jew has survived.

Hated and hating, again and again decimated by his persecutors, and within our own unrealizing knowledge far, far more than decimated, he yet outlives all that, and once again he has been added to the family of nations. Whether for his survival we are to account him the fittest, is another addition to our list of insolubles. And Ionia has gone down long since. Alas! that it should be so; that this high-minded and high-hearted experiment in the art of living should have had so brief a day. So much of what matters to make our poor human life worth-while was theirs. In a little time the Poet was followed by philosophers and scientists and sculptors. The Ionians blazed the trail for Athens. What a flash! surely the most brilliant of all the flashes in the historical pan—but they went down. It is no good saying that we could not have expected anything else, that it was inevitable that the few thousands in their county of a land should be crushed by heavyweights among their neighbours. Yet Judaea was not appreciably, if at all, larger than Ionia, and it also had crushing neighbours. But neither the paucity of their population nor the aggressiveness of their neighbours baulked the Jews of their longevity. Something else perhaps weighed in making up the Ionian account. Perhaps, sadly be it said, they were too much lacking in the Semites' intransigence, too tolerant for survival in this harsh, battling world. How difficult it is to be open-minded without being sceptical, without being ineffective at the crucial moment, without being left behind talking when the high gods have staged one of their now-or-never crises. Life at times calls inexorably on a man to make up his mind and to be quick about it. Then to halt between two opinions is to be undone. Impartiality is a narrow ridge, and the impartialist must needs have himself well in hand or he will slide down into the valley of indecision. Perhaps reasons of this sort may account for the Ionian day being so soon lost. Never for a moment less do we owe them the salutation of our gratitude and our reverence. They have put the whole world under their debt, for it was they who nurtured Homer, they who raised the first round of applause that acclaimed his *Iliad*.

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions:

Theology and relevant studies: works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work: books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea: a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

THEOLOGY
AND RELEVANT STUDIES

The Doctrine of the Trinity. By R. S. FRANKS. 210 pp. Duckworth. 8s. 6d.

Dr. R. S. Franks, doyen of Congregational theologians, has given us as excellent a book on the Trinity as could be compassed within just over 200 pages. It is well balanced, lucid, and may well serve as a first text-book on this important and difficult branch of theological study. While it is fortunately true that belief in God, acceptance of salvation through Christ, and experience of the power of the Holy Spirit do not depend on a knowledge of how those Three are One, yet the Christian thinker must try to get his ideas in some way systematized, both for his own thinking's sake and in order to commend his faith to intelligent people. As Dr. Franks truly says, "The formation of the doctrine of the Trinity will appear as an argument from history to a metaphysic as the solid basis that gives meaning to the history" (p. 2).

In Part I an analysis is given of the New Testament data. The various strands, Pauline, synoptic, Johannine and other, are identified, and due recognition, here as later, is given to the Hellenic element, which some, like Cullmann, tend to minimize. Without depreciating Paul, Dr. Franks sees in St. John, with his clear concept of Logos and Paraclete, "the last word in New Testament theology" (p. 55). But we look to the New Testament for facts and norm, not for formulated doctrine, which follows later.

Part II, in a masterly seventy pages, shows how the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity was laboured out by the Fathers and the Great Councils. Justice is given to the parts taken by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Augustine, the Cappadocians and John of Damascus. It is shown how delicate and difficult it was to formulate a doctrine of the Trinity avoiding on the one hand Tritheism (that there are really three Gods working in close understanding) and on the other hand Modalistic Monarchianism (that there is really only one God, who manifests Himself in three different modes). The meaning of the orthodox view is carefully explained: in Latin theology, one Substance in three Persons; in Greek theology, one Essence in three Hypostases. At best we only talk in mystic symbols: the one Substance or Essence signifies the oneness of the Godhead in power, love and purpose; the three Persons or Hypostases signify the simultaneously co-existing and mutually harmonious operations and operatives of that power, love and purpose. "We may admit that it is only analogically that God is so thought of" (p. 126). Only because it may be hoped that this book may run to many editions would I point out that the much quoted

Greek in this section has many errors of breathing: on pages 46, 81, 92 (two), 114 (two). When so much in the Post-Nicene struggle depended on clear distinction between the words Homoousian and Homoiousian, it is unfortunate that Homoousian is printed for Homoiousian in the seventh line from the foot of page 107. As a matter of exactitude, on p. 123 I should prefer "though not subsisting in a hypostasis of its own" to "though not itself a hypostasis".

Part III carries the survey through the Middle Ages and Reformation to modern times. In Aquinas the summit of the ancient ascent is reached, and he is still authoritative to Roman Catholicism. The Lutheran and Reformed churches were not at first deeply concerned about the problem, but orthodoxy was implied. Then came a period during which the early battlefields were revisited: Dynamistic Monarchianism and Neoplatonism reappeared as Socinianism and Latitudinarianism; but there were no Great Councils to solve the problems. The tangled story is traced to the nineteenth century, when Schleiermacher and Ritschl, influenced inevitably by Kant, approached the problem in what may be termed the modern idiom. There is less philosophic assurance, there is greater realization of the implications of transcendence, there is more anxiety as to the criteria of personality. That being said, both Schleiermacher and Ritschl seem reminiscent of Dynamistic Monarchianism and Adoptianism. The former sees in Christ a "God-consciousness, which was a veritable existence of God in Him" (p. 168), and the latter "interprets His pre-existence by saying that He exists for God eternally as that which He appears to us in time" (p. 174). Karl Barth, in the same tradition but influenced by Kierkegaard, tries to formulate a Trinity whose modes seem at the same time Sabellian (in Schleiermacher's sense) and yet "necessary distinctions in the Essence" (p. 181). But for Barth God is utterly transcendent, touching man only in Jesus Christ (p. 183). If that is so, can any doctrine of the Trinity be other than speculation on the unknowable?

The book ends with a fair statement of the divergent contemporary views. Apart from Barth, already described, Dr. Franks deals most carefully with Moberly and Hodgson, both of whom endeavour to reinterpret credal orthodoxy, but, Dr. Franks thinks, unconvincingly. His own views are not fully indicated; they would seem to be a blend, in the light of the modern standpoint, of both kinds of Monarchianism and Adoptianism: God "communicated Himself in Absolute Potency to Jesus. . . . So it was that as the Divine grace filled Christ's human consciousness and completely dominated it, He remained a man like other men, and was yet the Word of God made flesh, who through the communication of His consciousness of God to others in the Spirit is the Saviour of the World" (p. 200).

Whether or not we accept the author's view-point, we must pay tribute to his masterly survey of the field and to his statement of the problem. Orthodox, neo-orthodox and modern alike have here a source-book showing whence their views come, and all will be wiser and more wisely tolerant for reading it. A. R. VINE.

The Fulness of Time. By JOHN MARSH. 189 pp. Nisbet. 15s.

Dr. Marsh's article on *Time* in *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, and his essay in the recent composite volume, *Biblical Authority for Today*, have sketched for us the broad outlines of his thought on the Biblical conceptions of Time and History, and have prepared our minds for its fuller exposition in this book. Dr. Marsh begins with a study of the Hebrew and Greek words used by the Biblical writers to express their conceptions of Time, History and Eternity. He finds that the idea of abstract Time—what we might call "clock" Time—is missing from the Old Testament. Times

and seasons are there distinguished by their contents rather than by their co-ordinates in some frame of chronological reference. This "realistic" conception of Time is accompanied by the idea of the "appropriate" time or *opportunity*. There is not only a time *of* harvest—the thought of which calls up not the name of a month (August, say) but images of waving corn, sickles and reapers—but also a time *for* harvest, when fields "white unto harvest" must be reaped if the crop is not to be lost. For the Biblical writers, History is made up of certain times which are God's appointment and whose contents are His revealing and redeeming acts. But when God acts in history men become aware of a supra-temporal quality in Him and the acts He performs. They use a temporal term to express this quality and call it everlastingness. There is thus a temporal age and a supra-temporal age, or—as the New Testament puts it—"this age" and "the age to come". Yet the two ages are not consecutive. In Jesus "the age to come" has already begun, in the midst and alongside of the present age.

The Hebrews derived the conception of God as acting in history from their experience of the Exodus. This was the point at which God delivered Israel from bondage, made the nation His people and established His Covenant with them. The pattern of the Exodus happenings becomes the pattern of God's saving acts in later ages. In particular, it becomes the category of thought wherein the New Testament writers, following the lead of Jesus Himself, interpret the saving work of the Messiah. Thus the original Exodus was not only a revelation of God through His saving act; it was the foretelling of a still greater and more significant Exodus. It is in Christ and His saving work that Exodus is fulfilled.

Dr. Marsh's treatment of the category of fulfilment is a valuable contribution to our understanding of the Biblical revelation. Yet is is just here that many of his readers will have misgivings. No doubt the New Testament writers do in fact employ the framework of the Exodus narrative in their interpretation of the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus. But Dr. Marsh seems to claim that this interpretation, which marks a point-by-point, detailed correspondence of the second Exodus with the pattern of the first, goes back to Jesus Himself. He may be right. It is for New Testament scholars to cross-examine him on this. But to an inexpert eye some of his exegesis seems far-fetched, and indeed this new typology calls for careful scrutiny. In some hands it might be used to by-pass the results of historical criticism, and to buttress interpretations of Scripture as subjective and speculative as anything ever produced by the extreme modernist school.

Yet to end on this note would be most unfair to a fine and rewarding book. What Dr. Marsh has to say on eschatology, the relation of Time to Eternity, and the contrast between philosophies of history founded on the category of succession and the Christian understanding of history with its characteristic category of fulfilment, is marked by deep religious feeling and insight, and is expressed with enviable clarity. In an appendix he takes account of Cullmann's position, from which his own differs in important respects. It is good to know that Dr. Marsh has it in mind to give us another book in which he will deal with what historians and philosophers have had to say regarding these high themes. H. F. Lovell Cocks.

Natural Religion and Christian Theology. Gifford Lectures, 1951. First Series: *Science and Religion.* By Charles E. Raven. Cambridge. 21s.

"Many of us who insist upon the continuity of nature and supernature cannot approve, indeed strongly resent, the process which has first abstracted from the natural world certain elements in it susceptible to quantitative

study and mechanistic interpretation, and then has proceeded to claim that these elements of it do in fact constitute the whole of the natural order" (p. 3). That sentence contains all the clues to Professor Raven's *magnum opus*. He devotes this volume to a study of man's intellectual response to his natural environment, beginning with the Bible and the patristic theologians, passing rapidly through the Middle Ages where he invites us to respect the Franciscans as well as Albertus Magnus, to the genesis and development of the "modern" scientific approach. His avowed intention is to vindicate a conception of "natural science" which is larger and more generous in scope than that which has come to prevail under the presiding genius of physicists and mathematicians. He therefore devotes much space and loving care to the story of the naturalists whose labours in the 16th and 17th centuries are so often eclipsed in histories of science by the greater glory of Newton. He shows (pp. 107ff.) how "the New Philosophy" secured a welcome in 17th century England, which bespeaks for it merits which are not now associated with the scientific attitude, and he shows how the Cambridge Platonists reaped a harvest from the new vision of "the worth, cohesion and wholeness of the natural order". But the baleful figures of Gassendi, Newton, Linnaeus and finally Darwin were waiting in the wings to capture the stage and spoil the drama, and incidentally to precipitate "*the* conflict between science and religion", which, on this view, is a somewhat unnecessary feature of the modern scene. The book provides a refreshing and informative version of this profoundly significant element in the human story. I am not sure that the new perspective from which the story is told will stand up to close and detailed scrutiny. But readers who know what axes are on the grindstone (and the author reveals them with passionate sincerity) will profit greatly from this exposition. Comment on the issues raised by Professor Raven must be reserved until the Second Series is published and makes them explicit. W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

Reason and Revelation: A Question from Duns Scotus. By N. MICKLEM. 106 pp. Nelson. 8s. 6d.

Anyone who desires an insight into the nature of Medieval theological thought in its fullest exercise may be recommended to study carefully Dr. Micklem's paraphrase and exposition of the first Question from the *Opus Oxoniense* of Duns Scotus, particularly if he is prepared to go on from Micklem's English to struggle with the crabbed Latin of Duns Scotus himself in the original text, which is printed at the end of the book.

The Question is: "Whether man in the present life needs to receive by supernatural inspiration some special doctrine which he could not attain by the natural light of the intellect?" The philosophers, basing themselves on Aristotle, say No. Scripture (II Tim. 3, 16) says Yes. Duns resolves the contradiction much as Aquinas had done before him. Though the intellect has all Being for its province, it only reaches it by way of abstraction: it cannot attain to the concrete Being of the Transcendent God, whose character and plan for our salvation we cannot know except as he reveals Himself.

The constructive Aquinas was called the Angelic Doctor. Duns Scotus received the name of the Subtle Doctor, because with him critical analysis predominates over positive statement. He is not satisfied to state premises and draw a conclusion: he goes on to prove the premises themselves. He refutes the philosophers, and then refutes their refutation of his refutation. The argument becomes a tangle: we seem to be lost like Dante in a dark wood with no way out. Yet Duns himself never loses the trail: in the end he brings us out triumphantly. Micklem follows his steps with great care: the paraphrase and exposition are admirable. Finally, to complete the work,

he shows how the arguments of Duns can be transformed so as to become relevant to our own situation at the present time. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Eschatology: Four Papers Read to the Society for the Study of Theology. 90 pp. Oliver & Boyd. 6s.

This book presents interesting sidelights on a prominent aspect of modern theological discussion. Professor William Manson gives an interpretation of the eschatology of both Old and New Testaments. He insists that the Christianity of the New Testament, though pervaded by the sense of fulfilment, creates its own Eschatology of Glory, the scene of which is the world in which man's life is lived, and in which Christ died and rose. Professor G. W. H. Lampe makes an interesting survey of early patristic eschatology, pointing out the inconsistency and Biblical fundamentalism of the Fathers, and stressing the importance of sacramental teaching in maintaining an eschatological emphasis which otherwise might have been dissipated by Gnosticism. Professor T. F. Torrance in a forceful paper on the eschatology of the Reformation gives an illuminating analysis of the teaching of Luther, Bucer, and Calvin from a standpoint heavily in favour of Calvin, and commending him for thinking of apocalyptic not (as Luther did) as a message of consolation for the godly under trial, but as the unveiling of the positive creative purpose of God. The Rev. W. A. Whitehouse in a difficult but rewarding paper on the modern discussion of eschatology is concerned to explore the implications of the Biblical acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the eschatological act of God. His standpoint may be indicated by his contention (p. 88) that 'it is not safe for the Church to seek a statement of its message which is only *suggested* by the New Testament, and which, for the sake of accommodation to the 'modern mind', exhibits dilutions and accretions of which in fact Biblical theology is intolerant'. Many readers would have welcomed greater elucidation and defence of Mr. Whitehouse's view of "the content of Scripture in its integrity" than is possible here. On the whole, this little book is a stimulating introduction to some aspects of the vast subject with which it deals. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Plotinus. By A. H. ARMSTRONG. 174 pp. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

This is the ninth volume in the series "Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West". In an unequal series, this work ranks high. Prof. Armstrong has dealt with a very difficult subject in a doubly satisfactory manner: he has produced a book which students may study with profit, and has dealt with a complicated matter in a way which will enable the general reader at least to gain general ideas about it. Plotinus lived in the third Christian century. Educated in Alexandria, he removed to Rome, where he became a teacher of philosophy and mystical religion. He was not a Christian, and based his system mainly upon Plato, but with modifications direct and indirect from many other sources. His system is in effect Neoplatonism, combining philosophic penetration into the origin and structure of the universe with belief in the ability of the individual to find direct communion with the One. Christian and Neoplatonic modes of thought gradually fused, and systematic Christian theology owes much to Neoplatonic ideas. The ability of the Great Councils to formulate doctrine was in a measure due to the hard thinking of Plotinus on the philosophical background of religion. His life and teaching well repay study, and Prof. Armstrong has provided an excellent introduction. A. R. V.

An Analysis of Resemblance. By R. W. CHURCH. 136 pp. Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.

This book well illustrates the present state of philosophical study. All parts of the field are under review; previously assured conclusions are re-

examined from every possible point of view; nothing is taken at face value. If all this seems to detract from what was once regarded as the prime object of philosophy—arrival at a total comprehension—it must none the less be accepted as inevitable, and we must bear with the philosophers while they struggle with problems which a new outlook has raised. Prof. Church has chosen a most confusing subject, resemblance. His work is a suggestive essay rather than a systematic treatise. He has much to say that is valuable, though much of it is only common sense in scholarly phrasing. Some of his points are over-pressed. He devotes a whole chapter to Russell's so-called puzzle—three successive shades so similar that the first and third could be distinguished from each other, yet neither could be distinguished from the second. The physical answer is simple and obvious. He also seems to deny that there is any resemblance between a heavenly body and an actress both called "star". They are certainly not the same; but the word "same" is best avoided in philosophic discussion. If "same" means "identical in every particular and circumstance", no two things are the same. The resemblance between the heavenly body and the actress is that each is gazed upon with miscomprehending admiration, and is recognized as being above the usual level. However, we must not go too far in fulfilling the claim on the dust cover that the work "will arouse much discussion"! It deals with a difficult matter in a very competent and suggestive manner, and is to be commended to all who wish to follow the trends of present day philosophy. It should perhaps be added that this is hardly a book for the general reader.

A. R. V.

In *The Feast of Unreason* (Watts, 15s.) Mr. Hector Hawton attacks Existentialism with the vigour and forthrightness of a rationalist who will stand no nonsense. His book is an interesting and lively account of the leading figures and conceptions and includes an excellent bibliography. Mr. Hawton has read widely in his subject, and many of his criticisms are shrewd. Yet the book as a whole seems to miss the mark: Mr. Hawton knows all the existentialist answers and makes mincemeat of them; but he hardly convinces us that he really understands the existentialist question.

H. F. Lovell Cocks.

Nature and Man in Biblical Thought. By E. C. Rust. 318 pp. Lutterworth. 31s. 6d.

A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity. By G. A. F. Knight. (Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 1). Oliver & Boyd. 6s.

We hear much today of Biblical theology. Here are two of its products. Professor Rust's book has two aspects: theological, the interpretation of the meaning of the ground surveyed; and phenomenological, the exposition of the various ways in which nature and man are thought of in the Bible. In the judgment of the present reviewer it is the phenomenological aspect of Professor Rust's work, chapters II—VIII, the bulk of the work, which is the more successful.

Professor Rust has done a real service by gathering together and expounding in a lucid and readable form the more important results of Biblical research during the last fifty years. He has drawn into his net the linguistic-theological studies of Kittel's theological Word Book, and the studies of Eichrodt, Köhler, Pedersen, Wheeler Robinson, Aubrey Johnson and many others; and he has given a competent survey of the treatment of nature and man in the O.T., in later Judaism, and in the N.T. Particularly valuable are his treatment of the Genesis myths (pp. 26-37), creation, con-

servation, and the fertility cults (pp. 71-81), Hebrew psychology (pp. 101-116), and creation in later Judaism (pp. 148-160). In details there is always room for difference of opinion, for example, as to reliance on the judgments of Duhm, or the treatments of *exousia* and *dunamis* as virtual equivalents. So far as miracles are concerned, Professor Rust seems to beg many questions by removing the issue from historical judgment and transferring it to the realm of faith.

The book also raises the important and difficult question: if Biblical thought is as Professor Rust says it is, what truth has it for us today? His own answer to this (given in chapters I and IX) is that we dispense with Biblical categories at our peril, and that science no longer opposes the conception of *creatio continua,* and this conception apparently solves all our difficulties. But it would seem that without a serious probing of the hermeneutical problem of how to handle this large body of material, such a study helps to remove the Bible further from our world instead of bringing it nearer to us. But the information given will be of great value to students.

Professor Knight's study is a more exciting personal adventure and contains many valuable points of detail about the way in which the O.T. thinks of God. His conclusion, after discussion of the relevant terms for the presence of God, is that we must think of God's nature in terms of organism.

Such a study is a valuable interim study of the Biblical background of the Doctrine of the Trinity, but the approach and methods used need much testing before they can be confidently accepted. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus. By T. W. MANSON. 104 pp. C.U.P. 10s. 6d.

Professor Manson has made it clear in his published work that he finds his theological standing-ground in the Synoptic Gospels as sifted and tested by historical criticism. This gives him a certainty of outlook which is not overawed by traditional theology nor unduly moved by contemporary fashions of thought. In these Shaffer Lectures he has further explored this territory and given us in lucid English an exposition constantly illuminated by his own pioneer historical research. He contrasts the ministry of Jesus, as essentially a dedication to the unremitting service of God, with the Jewish messianic ideal of complete and immediate political autonomy. The failure of John the Baptist, to make the Jewish legal religion effective, makes the fact that Jesus in his ministry was trying to do something quite different stand out with vivid clarity; and the sacrifice of the Son of Man is the logical issue of his service. Dr. Manson has notable new interpretations of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, which he treats as the domination by Jesus of a politically messianic mob, and of the Cleansing of the Temple, which he places at the Feast of Tabernacles, six months before the Crucifixion. His chapter on the Resurrection (too short to be fully satisfying) treats the Resurrection as fundamentally a restoration to life in this world, by which the ministry of Jesus was not stopped, but goes on. How Dr. Manson would treat the Ascension is not clear. Dr. Manson's opinions must, of course, run the gauntlet of reasonable criticism, but assuming the substantial truth of much that he has written the question which needs urgent consideration is "How, then, do we interpret the Gospels in detail as conveying truth for our day?" H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

The Biblical Doctrine of Infant Baptism. By PIERRE CH. MARCEL. 256 pp. James Clarke. 15s.

This is an able defence of infant baptism by a pastor of the French Reformed Church. The translator is the Rev. P. E. Hughes. Technicalities

have been avoided as far as possible, so that the book is readily intelligible to the layman as well as to the theologian.

The author does not deal with infant baptism in detail until page 187 is reached, and the reader who turns eagerly to this last section first is warned in a footnote to retrace his steps, because it cannot adequately be assessed without a knowledge of the preceding argument. This brings out, through a detailed examination of the Biblical passages, the setting of the sacrament in the total picture of the covenant. This is the real value of the book.

There are three main parts: "General Study of the Sacraments", "The Covenant of Grace", and "Baptism: Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace".

The relation of the Word and the sacraments is such that while the Word can exist in itself without the sacraments, the sacraments can never be complete without the Word. In fact, to quote Calvin, "a sacrament never exists unless the Word of God precedes it". The sacrament is an essential confirmation of the Word, but it is the Word which makes a sacrament what was before not a sacrament. Without the Word water is merely water, and bread and wine merely bread and wine. Where faith is present the Word and the sacraments, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, become a means of grace which is essentially the same in both cases.

The second main part calls for more extended comment than is possible here. M. Marcel rightly finds in circumcision the forerunner of Christian baptism, because both are the sign and seal of the covenant of grace, equally for proselytes who enter the covenant and for the children of those who are already within the covenant. Yet he is in danger of underestimating, with a certain type of current interpretation, a real discontinuity between the old and new dispensations which cannot be ignored by over-emphasis on the continuity in biblical *Heilsgeschichte*. To declare that "all that we have today in our sacraments the Jews had formerly in theirs, namely, *Jesus Christ and His spiritual riches*" (p. 90, author's italics), is to make inadequate distinction between the promise and the nature of its actual fulfilment in history.

In the third part the baptism of adults is first dealt with, and then that of children. In defending the latter the problem of the absence of clear references to this practice in the New Testament has to be faced. M. Marcel cites Cullmann's reminder "that *adult Baptism for sons and daughters born of Christian parents . . . is even worse attested by the New Testament than infant Baptism*" (p. 188). But the real justification of infant baptism is the Biblical doctrine of the covenant to which children of believers belong equally with their parents. Here is to be found the answer to the Baptist objection that faith must precede baptism, which is impossible in the case of infants. Children are legitimately baptized without faith or repentance, because they belong to the covenant. M. Marcel's conclusion will win wide assent outside the Baptist camp, that infant baptism and the baptism of adults on profession of faith ought to coexist. There is much else of interest and practical value in this important addition to the literature of a controversial subject. An index should have been provided. A. J. B. HIGGINS.

Archbishop Pecham. By DECIMA L. DOUIE. 362 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 42s.

The appearance of a biography of an Archbishop of Canterbury is always something of an occasion. In Dr. Douie John Pecham (d. 1292) has found a biographer whose scholarship is of the purest and most painstaking kind. After teaching at Paris, Oxford and Rome, and gaining "a considerable reputation as both a scientist and a poet", Pecham had thirteen years at Canterbury, and it is mainly on his archiepiscopate, which marks "an

important stage in the relations between Church and State'' that Dr. Douie has concentrated. She makes the attractive suggestion that ''his inclusion of proctors of the parochial clergy in Convocation may be the result of the strong representative tradition in the Franciscan constitution''; for Pecham was a Franciscan, the only Franciscan ever at Canterbury. His character Dr. Douie describes as ''high-principled, austere, conscientious, energetic and efficient''. ''Litigation was perhaps his only luxury.'' He was ''a vigorous fighter for the rights of his see'', often at odds with his suffragans, such as Thomas Cantilupe of Hereford. Dr. Douie acutely observes that the miracles which after Cantilupe's death led to his canonization ''began at the time of the resumption of the dispute'': ''the new cult of Cantilupe was a sign of Pecham's own unpopularity''. This is a specialist work, written with no eye to any but professional scholars; but from it one may not only gain a clear impression of a distinguished prelate but also learn much about mediæval ecclesiastical life and thought by the way.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Protestant Dissenting Deputies. By the late BERNARD LORD MANNING. Edited by ORMEROD GREENWOOD. 498 pp. C.U.P. 50s.

Neither the reputation of the author nor the importance of the subject treated is likely to make *The Protestant Dissenting Deputies* in any sense a popular book, for the importance of the subject will bear little relationship to its interest to the public, and its interest to the public is likely to be gravely impaired by its price of publication. Yet one can confidently affirm that this is a book which has demanded to be written, and which deserves to be studied by any Free Churchman who is grateful for the civil and religious liberties he has inherited. The work of the Protestant Dissenting Deputies through more than two centuries of struggle has been unspectacular, but it has never been undistinguished. Mr. Manning has shown us that the effectiveness of their work ''depended on the care with which they confined themselves to their own concerns.'' Their objectives were limited objectives, but they limited themselves to these only because the ultimate goal—the complete civil liberty of Dissent—was ever kept in view. How far they succeeded, and what we owe to their efforts, this book may recall to us.

For this reason the serious blemishes which the book contains are bound to be an even greater cause for regret. Although we are bound to sympathize with any editor who takes over a partly-finished work of detailed scholarship of this kind—especially from such a vigorous writer as Mr. Manning—we cannot but regret the inaccuracies of detail, the repetitions, the obscurities of style, and the inadequacies of index and bibliography that do occur. Perhaps, however, the most serious criticism springs from what might have been one of the book's most valuable assets—Mr. Manning's forthright style; for we feel that if the author had been granted opportunity to review his work he would surely have presented some of his prejudices in a softer light and with a lighter touch.

Nevertheless, let no criticism detract from the importance of this work. Mr. Manning has a proud story to tell, and it is forcibly and often movingly written: it will be a reminder to us that the price of our liberty has been eternal vigilance.

ROBERT S. PAUL.

T. R. Glover: A Biography. By H. G. WOOD. 233 pp. C.U.P. 21s.

This long awaited biography comes fully up to expectations. In T. R. Glover Dr. Wood has a subject after his own heart and he has presented to us in the round the uncommon figure of this front-rank classical scholar who was also a Baptist preacher, and who wrote equally well on Virgil and Plutarch and on Jesus of Nazareth. Time soon antiquates reputations and

the name of Glover probably rouses no such enthusiasm today as did the publication of his book *The Jesus of History* thirty years ago. Nevertheless, the book remains his lasting memorial and represents a stage in the progress of Christian experience through which everybody must pass no matter what the theological mood of the moment. For over forty years Cambridge was the background of Glover's life. He was the best Public Orator that the University ever had. He was a most illuminating lecturer and writer. Stories gathered round him, and his biographer has made good use of the wealth of material at his disposal to make a most enjoyable book.

A. V. MURRAY.

The Free Churches and the State. Edited by A. R. VINE. 65 pp. Free Church Federal Council. 2s. 6d.

Three years ago the Free Church Federal Council set up a Commission on Church and State and in March this year authorized the publication of this Report (which is the work of an impressive body of scholars and owes much to the editing of Dr. Vine). Chapter One is an excellent survey of the four main types of Church-State relationship in the contemporary world. Chapter Two is a clear, concise and scholarly survey of Church history which shows the Free Churches of this country in their origin and development. Chapter Three restates the basic principles of the Free Churches in England and comments cogently and fairly on the Free Church attitude to the present acute dilemmas in the Church of England caused by a desire for greater freedom and a determination to continue in a position of exclusive privilege. The importance of this publication is out of all proportion to its size and price. It deserves the careful study of all ministers and members of the Free Churches.

W. GORDON ROBINSON.

Church Relations in England. 15 pp. Carey Kingsgate Press. 6d.

This is the Baptist reply to the document of the same title which was the report of conversations between Anglican and Free Church representatives following upon the Archbishop of Canterbury's Cambridge Sermon of November, 1946. It is a careful, charitable, and considered answer which is of special interest to Congregationalists whose polity is so near to that of the Baptists (though their special emphasis on believers' baptism and the fact that " 'mutual open communion' does not as yet exist even for all members of Baptist churches" differentiates them from us). This report cannot accept the claims commonly made for episcopacy or the insistence that inter-communion should be made dependent upon episcopacy and episcopacy linked with ordination of ministers and admission of members. It calls for a further examination by Baptists and other communions of the place of the local church in the Body of Christ, the nature and authority of the ministry and of ordination, and the nature of *episcope* in the New Testament and "episcopacy" and "oversight" today, and for finding ways other than intercommunion to demonstrate unity, work, and worship in Christ.

W. GORDON ROBINSON.

Spiritual Authority in The Church of England: An Enquiry. By EDWARD CHARLES RICH. 218 pp. Longmans, Green & Co. 21s.

Although Canon Rich has written this book with the situation of the Anglican Church primarily in mind, it is also written with the ecumenical discussions of recent years quite clearly as the background, and since the subject of Spiritual Authority is so obviously central to all ecumenical thinking it is to be hoped that the book will enjoy a far wider audience than the author's own communion. The book is written in a fine irenical spirit, and despite the author's clear bias we gain the impression that he is never concerned with scoring debating points, but with the discovery of the truth.

In particular we would wish to commend his careful reading of our own writers, although their are some remarkable omissions (notably P. T. Forsyth). We feel that although he may misunderstand their position, he never treats them unfairly.

At the same time, I do not think Canon Rich has really understood the Protestant position, particularly in relationship to the Church's continuity at the time of the Reformation. He says: "The Protestant bodies broke with their historic past. There was no continuity with the institutional Church against which they revolted. Consequently the Reformation took the form of a rallying cry such as Justification by Faith; and a doctrinal discipline and system were built round this formula" (p. 114). Two comments might be made about this. First we would ask, "But what if the Reformers discovered this 'rallying cry' to be at the heart of the Gospel? Would not that justify their action?" Secondly, we should have to ask whether the Church is to be thought of primarily as an institution, or primarily as a divine creation through the Holy Spirit; if the former is true, then there was certainly a Re-formation of the Church in the sixteenth-century; if the latter is true, we would deny that there was any essential break.

There are many other questions of interpretation upon which there would be sincere differences between the author and his Christian brethren in both the Protestant and Roman camps, but we would submit that this is an important book on a subject we cannot afford to neglect. We thank him for the spirit in which he has conducted his enquiry; for it is certainly a step forward when an Anglo-Catholic can affirm, "We can therefore no longer speak of God's 'uncovenanted mercies' to our separated brethren. . . . It is by reason of the fact that all who own the Name of Christ stand within the Covenant that the Divine Authority which Christ has bestowed upon His Church can be commended."

ROBERT S. PAUL.

Western Canon Law. By R. C. MORTIMER. 92 pp. A. & C. Black. 7s. 6d. (paper 5s.).

Congregationalism is not in principle, nor even in normal practice, a bye-form of ecclesiastical anarchy. As much may be claimed for the Church of England. But whereas we have not, and cannot have, a canon law, the Church of England has had, in some sense still has, and hopes before long in a more satisfactory form to have, a canon law. The Bishop of Exeter does not seriously deal with canon law in its relation to the New Testament revelation or to theological reflection; he keeps for the most part to history and will be found a pleasant guide down paths (bye-paths, as I fear) not often trodden by Free Churchmen.

N. MICKLEM.

What do we mean by Reunion? (A reply to 'Problems of Reunion' by the Bishop of Derby.) By C. B. Moss. 122 pp. S.P.C.K. 6s. 6d.

This book is an extremely lucid exposition of the thesis that the meaning of the Church is given once for all in the Fathers, and that from their thought and practice there can be no deviation. The Reformation is not repudiated in so far as it is compatible with the Fathers, but it must not be used to interpret them, and in so far as it contradicts them, it is false. Dr. Moss wants to expose the thought of the Bishop of Derby as, judged by this standard, vacillating and inconsistent, and also to make clear the gulf between the Church of England thus interpreted and the Reformed tradition. The book is interesting and charitable, and the awkward questions which it raises must receive a fair hearing. It is a pity that Dr. Moss thinks that Reformed Churchmen are concerned with the Invisible Church. If he had thought of our idea of the Church as a different conception of the Visible

Church he would have come nearer the truth. An interesting expression of his standpoint is his contention (p. 62) that "there is an essential difference between the belief that people ought to be baptized (with possible exceptions), and the belief that they must be baptized, because they cannot otherwise receive any Christian privileges". We must all have sympathy with the Church of England in its inability to come to any common mind about its own character, but Congregationalists who repudiate Dr. Moss's contentions ought not to be led to think that the differences between them and the more reasonable Anglicanism of the Bishop of Derby are anything other than formidable and complex. There is no easy road to Reunion.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Religion in 20th Century America. By HERBERT W. SCHNEIDER. 244 pp. Harvard University Press. $4.25 (English price, 27s. 6d.).

One of the first volumes of a new "Library of Congress Series in American Civilization", designed as "mid-century reports" on various aspects of American life, is devoted to this highly interesting stock-taking of the chief trends in religion in America since the beginning of this century. The writer, who is professor of Philosophy and Religion at Columbia University, owes much to Dean Willard Sperry's *Religion in America* (and duly acknowledges his debt) but this is a different kind of volume and a good companion volume to Dean Sperry's. Its six chapters review the "revolutionary age" in which religion now finds itself (and by religion the writer covers not only the Christian faith and Judaism but a host of queer movements on the periphery of Christianity), examine the institutional, moral and intellectual reconstructions which have taken place in answer to the revolution in thinking and in social habits, and tell of developments in public worship and of many extraordinary "varieties of religious experience" which have proliferated since William James first began to study them. A useful part of the book consists of its "exhibits" and appendix which bring together statistics and statements among which one of the most instructive is a comparison between the beliefs of five hundred ministers and five hundred theological students in reply to fifty-six questions about the Bible and Christian Doctrine.

The British reader has no warrant for derisive superiority as he reads of "the genial, democratic spirit of American culture in Christian dress" (which Professor Schneider condemns) or of the American Episcopal priest who concluded a children's sermon on Ascension Day by saying, "Children, the lesson which the Ascension teaches us is that there is always room at the top". Very significant changes have come over the patterns of institutional religion in the past half-century and Professor Schneider has a clear grasp of their nature and their implications. This is a book which is most instructive in its wide range of information and its illuminating analyses, and is very relevant to our own situation in this country.

W. GORDON ROBINSON.

The Pilgrim Church. By A. M. WARD. 216 pp. Epworth. 10s. 6d. cloth, 8s. 6d. paper.

In this work the Professor of Theology in the U.T.C., Bangalore, gives us an interesting account of the first five years of the new Church of South India. Strong feelings were aroused on various sides during the years of negotiation which led to this union in 1947; and though it is too early to make any definite judgments on the success of the move, both ecumenicalists and their opponents will find much of interest and encouragement in this well-documented account. Marcus Ward, like many others, is convinced that it was the will of God that these churches should unite. As one who

took part over many years in the negotiations, and who is still in close touch with one of the areas concerned, I feel that it is difficult to claim to be able to indicate the will of God so clearly on such disputed and complicated issues. Those who stayed out of the union, and had to suffer for it, felt and still feel that it was the will of God for them to do so.

The successes of the new Church are rightly stressed. But some of the failures indicated by the author may well be of more importance in the long run. For instance, the *South Indian Churchman* (p. 163) in an editorial, charges of the Church of South India with its essential foreignness: "It is not only foreign in its personnel; it is foreign in its *ethos;* it is foreign in its administrative machinery; it is foreign in its theology; and above all, it is foreign in its material resources." Marcus Ward admits the underlying truth of this. It is no new problem. Most European missionaries find it extremely difficult to dissociate their religion from Western traditions. Each Foreign Mission has tended to build up an extension of its own Western denomination. Independence of thought and practice on the part of Indian Christians has been frowned upon. Consequently, Christianity is still a 'foreign' religion in the eyes of non-Christians, though it has existed in India since the third century. The word 'indigenous' has for long been upon our lips, but Marcus Ward admits that on the side of the missionaries there is still a good deal of reluctance to part with power (p. 157). Even the L.M.S. has not always been able to hold in practice to its foundation principle of leaving converts free to choose their own form of church government. Those who have never been missionaries can hardly realize the depth of this problem of foreignness, and the handicap it is to the spread of the Christian religion in the continent of its birth. It is obvious that the Church of South India has made little progress in this problem. One helpful move might be to divert foreign missionaries and their resources more directly to evangelistic work amongst non-Christians.

We shall await with interest the movement of the next five years. If Christianity is to spread in India, Indian Christians will have to take charge of their own Church and stand on their own resources. H. V. Martin.

Faith and Order: The Report of the Third World Conference at Lund, Sweden, August 15-28, 1952. S.C.M. 3s. 6d.

This Report, latest in the lengthening line of ecumenical documents, should be read by all our ministers, and commended by them to as many of our church members as can be induced to give serious attention to the subjects with which it deals. The Nature of the Church, Ways of Worship, and Intercommunion, are themes on which there exists among the different Christian communions a growing consensus of view, which is more significant and deeper-going than might be imagined by those who are unacquainted with the progress of ecumenical discussion. This Report will be found to be a frank and informative statement both of our unity in Christ and of the disunity which we are trying to overcome.

H. F. Lovell Cocks.

The Further Journey. By Rosalind Murray. 197 pp. Harvill Press. 12s. 6d.

This is not a very comfortable book. The authoress is an enthusiastic convert to Romanism. Some years ago she wrote a book called "the Good Pagan's Failure" which shewed how much she disagreed with her very distinguished father. She has now written this further book to tell us how she is getting on. The introspection of the earlier pages may be pardoned as a device to persuade others to share her felicity. Many of the later pages are given to the spiritual misfortunes of pagans (which are serious) and of

Protestants (of whom the writer knows very little indeed). Much interest attaches to the rather disquieting incidental picture of what Romanism means to a convert. The book seems dominated by an ethical question for which the writer will not seem to all readers to have found a happy answer. Thus she is not altogether unaware of what Romanism is like, let us say, in Liverpool or Buenos Aires, and she has been brought up to be feelingly aware of the dignity, the integrity, the ethical ardour of the "paganism" which she has renounced. How is Romanism to be commended to those who share her knowledge? It is not difficult to find an unsatisfactory Romanist, but of course "it is not *as a Catholic* that he lies, or cheats, or pushes but as a person of inadequate culture or character or responsibility, whose religion has not yet transformed him". We must understand that "it is not, as is often supposed, that the Catholic puts no value on truthfulness and other natural virtues, but that he values something else still more. For him, supernatural faith or charity so far transcend the merely human values that these inevitably take a secondary place". For "the difference which in fact marks out the Catholic as such from those outside is metaphysical not moral". The writer does not claim to be one of those gifted Roman theologians who "can at once detect the weakness in Karl Barth", so we may pass without comment some of her theological statements which throw light on popular Romanism and which can always be repudiated by authority. N. MICKLEM.

Hebrew Marriage. By DAVID R. MACE. 271 pp. Epworth Press. 21s.

Dr. Mace presents a valuable historical survey of Hebrew marriage in this his latest book. Before diving into the depth of his subject he writes many pages on the early Hebrew Period, which are unnecessarily protracted by numerous quotations. A book written for the non-academic reader should avoid obscuring what the author believes by endless references to other writers' points of view. Thus in the first part of his book I had to search for Dr. Mace's opinion; but in the second part, which deals with the Old Testament period, I found myself in more direct touch. One feels indebted to him for all the painstaking work he has put into his close scrutiny of the records. At times, however, one feels that his idealism has led him astray in his interpretation of the data, because the early concept of monogamy and its application is not as evident as he would have us believe. However, packed full of information, the book is a useful reference volume.

The State of Matrimony. By REGINALD HAW. 214 pp. S.P.C.K. 21s.

This book may well be regarded as a companion to Dr. Mace's "Hebrew Marriage", for it deals with the Christian concept of marriage in England and Western Europe. The author has laboured conscientiously with all the available documents concerning Christian marriage. He presents the "Status" of marriage before the Reformation, and deals with the dubious influences which spread after the marriages of Henry VIII; he clearly marks the divergence of the Civil concept from that of the Ecclesiastical in the Act of 1857. Despite the arguments put forward for the idea that marriage should be regarded as a contract, the Anglican Church still maintains the "holy-status" point of view, and that no one should be allowed to remarry whilst the former spouse is alive. His conclusions are that it is for the Church to keep before the people the indissolubility of the marital bond, and that she should "demonstrate her readiness to serve the nation to the full by undertaking the thorough preparation and instruction of those who come to be married at her altars". W. E. SARGENT.

RELIGION
LIFE AND WORK

Knowing God. By JOHN HUXTABLE. 16 pp. Independent Press. 1s.

The Faith That is in Us. By JOHN HUXTABLE. 70 pp. Independent Press. 5s.

Knowing God reproduces six broadcast talks in the "Lift up your Hearts" programme, and constitutes a brief but rewarding journey of faith. Against the frailty and the approximate results of the mind's search for God stands the strength of faith which beholds God coming in Jesus Christ, manifesting His greatness in personal concern for sinful men, and the end of faith which, entering into relationship with God by prayer and obedience, issues in the changed heart and the new life. Governed in style and approach by its original purpose, the booklet now provides an excellent point of contact with people on the fringe of the Church and beyond it.

Those who require a fuller but no less assimilable account of our Christianity will read with pleasure *The Faith that is In Us,* comprising twelve articles which appeared in the *British Weekly*. The brevity of the work marks its usefulness and intention: to offer direct help to the ordinary Christian wayfarer, and to stimulate further and deeper inquiry. Sound instruction in the faith "once delivered" is balanced by plain directives in the faith now to be expressed. A book of challenge to those who hesitate upon the frontier, but one of equipment to those who will cross it, going forth as witnesses to Christ.

CONRAD BONIFAZI.

Questions Concerning Jesus By A. PRICE HUGHES. 93 pp. Epworth. 5s.

The rhetorical style of the beginning creates a slightly artificial picture of Jesus, but the remainder of the book recognizes the difficulties raised by Jesus concerning Himself and His work. Forthrightly, persuasively and with knowledge, Mr. Hughes sets out sixteen replies which treat of the life and teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus. He aims at making sure that our questions are "not acts of treachery but signs of interest in the greatest Person in history"; but not only do these chapters offer wisdom, they demand of their readers an answer concerning Christ.

CONRAD BONIFAZI.

The Book of Job (Torch Commentaries). By ANTHONY and MIRIAM HANSON. 118 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

This is a well arranged commentary. The Introduction supplies all the necessary information, and the material is neatly broken up for easy assimilation. But unfortunately the matter of the book shows signs of carelessness and even superficiality. Three of the five commentaries are out of print; a fourth is ascribed to the wrong publisher. The English is marred by jargon. "Encounter" is a favourite word; the phrase "more sinless" occurs. The discussion of Ch. 31 needs to be examined in the light of the two appendices on that same chapter in Stevenson's Schweich Lectures on Job.

There is weakness in handling matters Hebraic. For example, the authors suggest that in Ch. 39, 25, the Hebrew reproduces "the snort of a horse"; but this is simply a human interjection, used metaphorically, and surely it is ignorance of the Old Testament that makes the authors say that the attitude of the Jew in Psalm I is "upright, unpitying . . . without

compassion and complacent" (p. 18), and that "In the Bible the devotee does not search for God. . ." (p. 77).

The authors refer to one commentary as "feeble" and to some unnamed "well-meaning commentators". Would it be fair to suggest that they deserve such labels themselves? J. WOOD.

The Preacher and His Greek Testament. By R. M. L. WAUGH. 104 pp. Epworth. 10s. 6d.

This purports to be a book for the preacher rather than for the scholar. It can certainly be commended, with some reservations, to preachers; and that commendation should be given. Mr. Waugh has gathered together a great deal of useful information concerning various words and passages in the New Testament, and has presented that information in a manner which will give help to the preacher. The derivation and usages of words are given, interesting parallels are quoted, and effort is made to bring out the real force and meaning. There are useful indexes to Greek words and scripture texts, and the preacher will often profit by turning to this little book before preparing his sermon. But a word of warning must be given. Mr. Waugh is an intelligent compiler rather than an exact scholar, and many of his opinions need to be taken with some reserve. There is a terrible blunder on page 93: "We note, for instance, that the word for 'therefore' (ouden) is the first word in Romans 8, 1." Ouden means 'no,' and the word for 'therefore' (ara) stands second in this sentence. He uses the grammatical expression "strong verb" in quite a wrong sense on p. 53. There is sometimes confusion between original and derived meaning. However, he has gleaned widely, and has gathered much information into small compass. Used with discretion, this will be a useful book. A. R. V.

Mrs. Mish (Epworth Press, paper, 2s.) is an anonymous pamphlet by a missionary's wife. It is written in sparkling style: and all too near below the surface of the sparkle lie tears. An evening with this account of what being a wife and mother on the mission field means would prove stimulating to any missionary committee.

The Essex Hall Lecture, founded in 1892 to be "on religious themes of general interest", was given in 1953 by Sir Hector Hetherington on *The Social Function of The University* (Lindsey Press, paper, 2s.). Sir Hector first vividly demonstrates the new financial dependence of the University upon the State with the consequent possible threat to its freedom. He goes on to define the functions of a University as research, teaching and the communication of a culture. If we ask where the religious part of the theme comes in, we find it in the closing pages where it is said that the educational process has failed unless it helps a man "to come reflectively to some affirmation on the central issues of his personal and social life, to know intelligently what he believes and where his primary loyalties should lie".

The Children's Book of British Saints, by Hugh Ross Williamson, is the latest addition to a deservedly popular series (Harrap, 3s.). The conventional picture on the dust-jacket matches the contents, a little history and much pious fairy story. By all means let our children hear of the moral courage of Sir Thomas More, but is it anything else but confusing to tell them in the same breath the absurd tale of St. Swithin mending the basket of broken eggs?

Marriage and Divorce is a Memorandum submitted to the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce by The Alliance. It is the work of Mr. Vincent Long, the Secretary of The Alliance, and may be obtained from its offices, 112 City Road, London, E.C.2, for 1s. It is an excellent statement of a moderate position, urging a long-term policy of education and

stressing the place of the voluntary organization in doing that essential work.

In *I Turn to Ducks* a well-known New Zealand writer, Rita F. Snowden, takes her cue from our Gloucestershire poet, F. W. Harvey. From the troubles of this world she turns, as he did, to ducks as symbols of the strangely entertaining and simple things of life. Of these she writes with sense and wit. Some delightful photographs of ducks help to make this an admirable gift book. It is published by the Epworth Press at 7s. 6d.

Mr. E. Cunningham gave the Congregational Union of England and Wales a shorter Chairman's Address than usual—*Faith, Fellowship and Finance* (Independent Press, paper, 9d.). It was none the worse for that. The only risk is that it may have been found too easy to hear or to read. This is definitely one of those utterances to which one returns and which is seen to be more deep and wise at each return. Our immediate problems are administrative and financial; our deep needs are spiritual. Mr. Cunningham goes to the real point at once, and then has no difficulty in showing that a people renewed in faith can master the problems before us. It is no airy optimism. We are given the figures and they have not been challenged. This Address will be one more factor in the renewal of our churches in faith, dedication and service, which is surely coming.

There has been a cordial welcome in these pages to the three series of *Asking Them Questions*, edited by Ronald Selby Wright. The same welcome is given to a volume bearing the same title and being a selection from the three (O.U.P., 8s. 6d.). We are given 43 of the most important questions and the best answers. The result is a volume of absorbing interest which will prove helpful to the enquiring mind of adolescent or adult.

William J. May has reached his half-century of books and is still at the wicket. *Mary-Martha's Jubilee Book* (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.) will please those who have welcomed his other books and his Martha-Mary series in particular.

Removing the Causes of War (Allen & Unwin, paper, 3s. 6d.) by Dr. Kathleen Lonsdale is the Swarthmore Lecture for 1953. The Lecture was delivered in abbreviated form on the evening preceeding the Friends' Yearly Meeting. It is here printed *in extenso*. Dr. Lonsdale makes a wide-ranging survey of human needs and human problems in a world of baffled governments. The approach of the Friends to such matters is known and honoured. It can be summed up as "Service in Love". People can only be urged to read this impressive book and to judge for themselves whether it is the only approach and whether love can only be expressed by the methods of the Friends.

JOHN WILDING.

A Doctor Heals by Faith. By CHRISTOPHER WOODARD. 171 pp. Max Parrish. 12. 6d.

Here is a book packed full of interest. If read uncritically it may prove intensely absorbing, and indeed may do much to bolster up one's faith in the healing power of the Holy Spirit. Doubtless many will find great comfort in what Dr. Woodard has written about his faith cures, beginning with his own son, and continuing up to the present day. But those who read his book somewhat critically are likely to be left wondering what exactly has gone wrong among those whose faith is evidently genuine, but in whom the healing miracle has never been performed. Dr. Woodard should know, as a medical man, whether an illness is physio- or psychogenetic, but before anyone can categorically state that both conditions respond to real faith—though he does admit quite honestly some failures—surely much further investigation is required. We cannot, as yet, truly say that healing is just a matter of faith. To accept Dr. Woodard's conclusion

we require, firstly, much more empirical evidences of "faith healing" that is not suspect of pure suggestion; secondly, a wide enough sample of those who, with similar diseases but without faith, have been cured by suggestion therapy; and thirdly, an equally large sample of sufferers with faith, but who have not been cured. A comparison of the results from these three groups will give a better assessment of the factors involved in healing, thereby enabling us to establish the presence, or otherwise, of the spiritual element.

W. E. SARGENT.

The Papacy: A New Appraisal. By JOHN P. MCKNIGHT. McGraw-Hill, 21s.

It is perhaps not an accident that the most recent and most critical books on the Roman Catholic Church have come from America: those by Mr. Avro Manhattan and Mr. Paul Blanshard, and this one by an American journalist of a Presbyterian tradition. Much of the first half of the book might have been omitted, as it testifies to the vitality of the author rather than to his power of discrimination. It is, however, extremely well documented and tries to be fair to Roman Catholicism while under no illusions about its menace, particularly to Western democracy. Mr. McKnight, as a journalist employed as the Associated Press correspondent in many Catholic countries and at present associated with the American State Department in Rome, has had ample opportunity for studying Catholicism at close quarters. He is well-informed about the history and policy of the modern papacy, especially about the present Pope who, as Eugenio Pacelli, was one of the most able representatives of the Vatican. Book Two is an account of the career and ideas of Pacelli who, as Pius XII, has exercised considerable influence over the recent history of the Roman Catholic Church: a man of wide diplomatic experience and, as Catholics go, enlightened views, described by Mr. McKnight as "a modern man set down in a dank maze of conservatism." In spite of his great gifts, he is "a prisoner alike of the past and of the future."

It may be that the United States is a strategic field in the modern Catholic policy of asserting its power with ever-increasing pressure. Pius XII's relations with the U.S.A., however, have on the whole been tactful, though his statement in 1949 that Catholic judges must not enforce civil laws of which the Church does not approve was typical of the interference of the Vatican in the professional activities of Catholics. Mr. McKnight inclines to the view that the Pope does not favour the policy of capturing the American government and replacing it with an authoritarian régime. Time will show. To a Protestant the Papacy is a peculiar institution; Mr. McKnight has thrown a good deal of light on its character and place in the modern world.

GERAINT V. JONES.

Selection I. A Yearbook of Contemporary Thought. Edited by CECILY HASTINGS and DONALD NICHOLL. Sheed and Ward. 15s.

This is an interesting collection of erudite articles chosen from Catholic periodicals, most of them continental, and should correct the idea that Catholics are unconcerned about contemporary learning. One article in particular, "The Mythical Dimension in Christian Baptism," is a valuable study of the place of archetypal and primordial ideas behind Patristic writing on baptism, and is illustrated with a wealth of references to Jung's analytical psychology and the relevance of its conclusions to the mythical aspect of sacramentalism. One of the most important contributions is the publication of correspondence (dated 1924) between Adolf von Harnack and Erik Peterson, formerly of Bonn, who later joined the Roman Church. This correspondence emphasizes the great differences between Protestantism—or at any rate Harnack's radical Protestantism which contained the seeds

of Protestant dissolution—and Roman Catholicism for, ecumenically, there is at present, in Peterson's view, no basis for any 'conversations' between Rome and Protestantism. Indeed, there would appear to be no such thing as Protestantism, only Protestantisms, whereas "primitive Protestantism was conscious of its essential dialectical connection with the Mother Church." In other words, Protestantism has no church theology because it has no dogma, and in the nature of things cannot have one. There is therefore no basis for a Catholic-Protestant approach. The weakest of these essays is Father Victor White's half-hearted defence of the "scandal" of the Assumption, which is the most unconvincing piece of Catholic apologetic I have ever read. The scope of the volume is comprehensive, as it includes biology, psychology, anthropology and philosophy, and a curious discussion by Father Fuller of the sun's standing still in Joshua x, 12. I gather that this volume will be followed by others which will continue this cross-section of contemporary Catholic thought. GERAINT V. JONES.

Society and Sanity by F. J. Sheed (Sheed and Ward, 225 pp., 10s. 6d.), is a companion volume to the author's *Theology and Sanity*. The 'sanity' of the titles is orthodox Roman Catholic teaching. This book has three sections, Man, Marriage and the family, Society and State. It contains nothing unexpected and most of what is said is commonly agreed among all Christian believers; it is, also, agreeably written. The Roman authoritarianism is never allowed to obtrude, and the defects in the societies it controls, and indeed in the societies where Protestantism is dominant, are almost entirely ignored. As a statement of Roman teaching it is good on its chosen level, but as a contribution to the conflicts and discussions in which the Roman Catholicism is only one party it is something less than adequate.

Communism and Man by F. J. Sheed (Sheed and Ward, paper, 3s. 6d.), is a cheap edition of a book first published in 1938. It is a useful popular statement of the Roman Catholic view of Hegel and Marx.

J. MILLS PHILLIPS.

The Christian Attitude to other Religions. By E. C. DEWICK. 220 pp. C.U.P. 25s.

Nothing could be more timely in the light of the present missionary situation than this book. Dr. Dewick is a missionary of long experience as well as a scholar, and he treats the subject both historically and also as an urgent practical problem. The rise of nationalism in Africa and the East and the consequent rehabilitation of the old religions have demanded a new missionary approach. It is the merit of this book that, while it shows warm appreciation of the religious value of other creeds than ours, it gives a reasonable and convincing statement in modern terms of the universal appeal of Christianity without giving way to extravagant dogmatism. It is a valuable and wise guide through our present confusions.

A. V. MURRAY.

Studies in Muslim Ethics (S.P.C.K., 27s. 6d.), by Dwight M. Donaldson, is a very competent piece of scholarship on a subject where there is a vital point of contact with Muslims. Like Christian ethics, the ethics of Islam are based upon religious doctrines: but due to Jewish, Greek and Christian influences, there is much in common. With Kant and with Plato, Muslims and Christians both postulate the moral freedom of man and the existence of God as primary truths on which we base our existence and activities as spiritual beings. The book contains copious quotations from the Quran and from Muslim writers. There is a full Bibliography and Index.

H. V. MARTIN.

Cloud of Witnesses. By ERIC SHAVE and ROBERT DUCE. 32 pp. Independent Press. 1s.

This is the text of the pageant presented during the Festival of Congregationalism at the Royal Albert Hall in London on 21st May, 1953. It is here offered to the churches as a dramatized Act of Worship for use by local churches.

The five historical scenes portray the witness made to the gospel of Jesus Christ by Gamaliel, Barrow and Greenwood, Oliver Heywood, the men and women of 'The Duff', and ordinary 20th century people on a new housing estate. The sixth and final scene is stylized, portraying Christ as the Healer and bringing out the message of Christ's power through the Church and His call to the Church to awake to the Word of God.

This is an exceptionally fine piece of writing, but some doubt may be expressed regarding the final scene. The doubt is whether the audience will easily recognize the symbolism of the Hospital Ward for the Church and the patients for Church members; a doubt made deeper by the very little preparation of the mind of the audience for a change of style.

For Heaven's Sake. By EDWARD MORTON. 79 pp. Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.

Three Acts: five men, four women.

This play is an attempt to enforce the validity of religion in a modern scene. The cast includes a Detective and the Managing Director of a large firm. It runs with a double plot:—a threatened strike at the factory over a workmen's compensation dispute and the smuggling in of diamonds.

Modern plays in which practical religion is portrayed are urgently needed by the church. They provide ways in which Church Drama Societies can aid the Church in her evangelistic task. It is a great pity, therefore, that this play is not better than it is. The plot is well conceived, but weakly executed. The author has forced his situations to make preaching points. He has not taken care to build up his plot into a convincing whole. Many of the situations are unreal.

Beyond the Doorway. By HENRY G. ARNOLD. 36 pp. Epworth Press. 1s. 6d.

A pageant in Four Acts for 57 characters and choir.

The theme of this pageant is "Decision". The Biblical characters range from Abraham to Paul, continuity being maintained by bringing them on the stage as acted illustrations of a sermon preached by Mark in Alexandria. Act 3 introduces Bede and Tyndale as instruments of the Divine purpose in making God's Word available to man. This Act somewhat spoils the continuity of this otherwise well constructed pageant.

From the Country of Moab. By DOROTHY M. ROBERTS. 20 pp. Epworth Press. 9d.

A Harvest Play in Five Scenes. 11 women, two men, Narrator, supers of Moabite women and Judean gleaners.

A dramatization of the story of Ruth. This play lacks drama and characterization. Did the author read the Book of Ruth before she started to write? All the dramatic incidents of the Biblical story are missing, and we have a flat tale in five very short scenes of Ruth leaving Moab with Naomi and of her eventual marriage to Boaz. JASON S. WRIGHT.

MISCELLANEA

Sociology of Communism. By JULES MONNEROT, translated by Jane Degras and Richard Rees. 339 pp. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

This is described as "perhaps the most exhaustive analysis of Communism yet written", and is, indeed, a good deal more than a discourse on politics or Marxist philosophy. Part I, entitled 'The Twentieth Century Islam', is an account of the rise and spread of the new messianism, with a description of its organization in Russia and beyond, including a chapter on the place and function of the 'men on the threshold', the fellow-travellers among other nations. Part II analyzes the nature of totalitarianism, with its modern forms deriving from Hegelianism, which is a complete—and therefore closed—system with nothing—art, religion or history—outside it. Marxism has a ground plan of Hegelianism, but adds to it a way of life and government as complete as the foundation philosophy. Thus Communism becomes a secular religion, for "a philosophy lived collectively cannot remain a philosophy, but becomes a religion". So on the spiritual plane the new absolutism of the 20th century is religion: on the temporal plane it is militant imperialism.

This book is timely because while the death of Stalin appears to be leading to a changed attitude in the Kremlin towards the western world, it yet remains to be seen whether the changes are in tactics, in strategy or are the first signs of a real desire to find a *modus vivendi* with the free world. But there is a warning, as this book shows, not only in the history but in the very nature of communism. In thus showing how communism has evolved in Russia, both in ideas and policies, and what elements in present day European society favour the growth of totalitarianism, the author is dealing with the heart of the problem. Not until these are understood can the communist 'campaign' be countered. "An empire or aggregate of nations and peoples grouped round one preponderant nation, which is also a kind of religious community, and at the same time engaged in sectarian proselytizing, underground warfare and the care of souls, here is a phenomenon which may well baffle members of a culture based on the two historic ideas of the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal, and the secularization of politics."

As might be expected in a work of this kind there are a few obscurities and digressions, but it is a scholarly attempt to see our present situation as it really is and to direct attention not only to the real strength and weaknesses of communism but to the weaknesses of the free world on which it thrives. The translation is excellent.

J. MILLS PHILLIPS.

Introduction to Malthus. Edited by D. V. GLASS. 205 pp. Watts & Co. 10s. 6d.

"A more simple-minded virtuous man, full of domestic affections, than Mr. Malthus could not be found in all England." So wrote Miss Martineau about the author of the *Essay on Population*, and in this book many writers, including the Editor, give a well-balanced and objective appreciation of a work which "has been so much talked of by persons who do not seem to have read it." H. L. Beales presents "The Historical Context of the Essay on Population", D. V. Glass writes on "Malthus and the Limitation of Population Growth", Alan T. Peacock gives an impartial assessment of Malthus' Theory "in the Twentieth Century". Doubtless the wide-spread concern about adequately feeding the world's rapidly increasing population

is turning many minds to a re-examination of Malthus' theory; but it is evident that, whilst it recommends a solution to an international problem, its practicability is beyond human possibility. Only too clearly have the writers of this book shown that neither does the reduction in marriages necessarily mean a limitation of population, nor a natural flow of marriages produce an increase in population. The book is well written, and I would suggest the Reprints of Malthus, at the end, be read before the above three criticisms. W. E. SARGENT.

An Introduction to Welsh Poetry. By GWYN WILLIAMS. Faber and Faber. 271 pp. 25s.

Professor Gwyn Williams has rendered a fine service to both Welsh and English students of the literature of these islands, particularly to the English, whose ignorance of the literature across the border is understandable in view of the language difficulty and of the fact that most of the competent books about it are in Welsh. I do not know what are the "current misconceptions" which are referred to on the dust-jacket and which Professor Williams is said to correct: they have eluded me. The book is admirably clear, illuminated from time to time by touches of humour, and informative to the point of detail. Indeed, it is less an 'introduction' to Welsh poetry than a fairly full account of its course from the 7th to the 16th centuries, for there is scarcely a poet (and in Wales there was an incredibly large number of poets during those centuries) whom he does not name. Professor Williams does not pass beyond the 16th century, which was followed by a barren period in which few names stand out, until the great outburst of the moderns of the present century.

Not the least interesting part of Professor Williams' book is the chapter in which he writes about the function of the poet in Welsh society, pointing out how his social importance differs from the status of the poet in England. Indeed, poetry is still held in greater respect in Wales than in England, as its place in the Eisteddfodau, both national and local, shows. In a useful appendix an account is given of the twenty-four measures permitted to the official Welsh poet; for the metrical complexity of Welsh poetry and the skill required to write it are among the lasting glories of Welsh literature. Professor Williams' book abounds in quotations, which need not put the English reader off as all are translated, which is also useful for Welsh readers who do not understand Medieval and Old Welsh. Professor Williams frequently indicates his debt to that great scholar, Sir Ifor Williams, who has contributed so much to our knowledge of a great literature. This is a competent piece of work. GERAINT V. JONES.

The Queen's Garland (O.U.P., 7s. 6d.), compiled by Miss M. C. Bradbrook and published for the Royal Society of Literature, is an anthology of verses made by her subjects for Queen Elizabeth I, now collected in honour of H.M. Queen Elizabeth II. The first Elizabeth was celebrated under many titles by many poets. The present anthology, which opens with two poems by the Queen herself, is divided into six sections: 'Gloriana', 'Belphoebe', 'Diana', 'Flora', 'Sweet Bessy' (local and popular verse), and 'Astraea'. It contains such well-known pieces as George Peele's "Farewell to Arms" and Ben Jonson's "Hymn to Diana", as well as many less familiar, including three acrostics on "Elizabetha Regina" by Sir John Davies. The book is beautifully produced. Obsolete words and meanings are glossed, but no translation is provided for the single poem in Latin nor, more surprisingly, for the one in Welsh. P. A. SPALDING.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (July) has 'Robert Hibbert and his Religious Background' by Stephen G. Lee; 'The Death Instinct and Western Man' by F. Claude Palmer; 'Ancient Light on a Modern Problem' (the law of God and the laws of man) by the late G. H. Poyser; 'The Comparative Study of Religions: its necessity and its dangers' by Rev. D. W. Gundry; 'The "Ethic" of Jesus and His "Theology" ' by Prof. A. C. Fox; 'Schweitzer and Radhakrishnan: A Comparison' (concluded), by C. W. M. Gell; 'Does "Realized Eschatology" make Sense?' by Rev. A. W. Argyle.

International Review of Missions (July). Dr. Ira W. Moormaw writes on 'Our Christian Mission and the Rural World'; Dr. W. Manson on 'The Biblical Doctrine of Mission'; Rev. G. Francis Gray on 'The Spread of Christianity in Asia'; Dr. S. Bolshakoff on 'Orthodox Missions Today'; Rev. S. H. Djxon on 'The Experience of Christian Missions in China'; Dr. Winburn T. Thomas on 'The Protestant Movement in Indonesia'; Mr. L. B. Greaves on 'African Education'.

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (July) includes 'Reflections on the English Methodist Tradition' by Rev. E. Gordon Rupp; 'Robertson of Brighton' by Rev. A. G. Curnow; 'Berdyaev' by Prof. Atkinson Lee; 'The Family of God Today' by Rev. Tom Dring; 'Commodore Perry and the Awakening of Japan' by Rev. T. Francis Glasson; 'The Challenge of Nietzsche' by Prof. E. L. Allen.

The Modern Churchman (June) includes an important article on 'De-Mythologising the Gospel' by Professor S. G. F. Brandon; 'Rationalism, Neo-Hinduism or Christianity' by Dr. E. C. Dewick; 'Liberalism in English Christianity Today' by Canon H. K. Luce.

Expository Times (June) includes 'James Denney's *Jesus and the Gospel*' by Prof. J. E. L. Oulton; 'Christian Belief in a Scientific Age' by Prof. Wm. Robinson; 'The Date of Luke-Acts' by Rev. C. S. C. Williams. (July) 'Emil Brunner's *The Mediator*' by Prof. J. C. Riddell; 'The Bridegroom Passage' by Dr. Roderic Dunkerley; 'A Century of Eschatological Discussion' by Dr. G. R. Beasley-Murray.

Evangelical Quarterly (July) has 'Growth in Grace in Puritan Theology' by Mr. O. R. Johnston; 'Deuteronomic Passages in the Book of Joshua' by Prof. E. J. Young; 'Typology' by Rev. H. L. Ellison; 'The Modern Eschatological Debate' (cont.) by Prof. T. F. Torrance.

The Friends' Quarterly (July) includes 'The Divine Harmony and Human Discord' by Wm. E. Wilson; a long review article by Maurice Creasey on Howard Brinton's *Friends for 300 Years;* 'A Letter to Quaker Scientists—and Others' by Ole F. Olden; 'Early Quakerism and Early Primitive Methodism' by Geoffrey F. Nuttall.

The Yale Review (Summer) includes 'How Strong is the New Germany' by Percy W. Bidwell; 'National Security and Individual Freedom' by Robert K. Carr; 'South Africa: a Land Divided against Itself' by Prof. Z. K. Mathews; 'Concepcion, Chile: South American Microcosm' by Cecil Robinson; 'Philosophical Style' by Prof. Brand Blanshard. The Book Reviews (50 pages) are excellent.

Huntington Library Quarterly (May) has 'The Break in the Circle' by Walter Muir Whitehill; 'Fulke Greville: Kingship and Sovereignty' by Prof. Hugh N. Maclean; 'James VI in the *Shepheardes Calender*' by Prof. Paul E. McLane; ' "Holy Joes" of the Sixties: A Study of Civil War Chaplains' by Prof. Bell Irvin Wiley.

* * *

The Rationalist Annual (1953, 2s. 6d.) includes 'The Scientific Study of Criminals' by Lord Chorley; 'Attitudes to Doctrinal Teaching in Schools' by Winifred Taylor; 'The Inconsistencies of Alfred Russel Wallace' by Sir Arthur Keith; 'Matrimonial Maladjustment' by Dr. H. H. Martin; 'An Alternative to Christianity' by J. B. Coates; 'The Bewildering Mystery of Mars' by Avro Manhattan.

Progress Report (1953) issued by the National Old People's Welfare Committee is a valuable account of its work, and is obtainable from 26 Bedford Square, London, W.C.1.

The Isle of Iona is a new, attractive, coloured map of the island with brief historical notes issued as a folder (2s. 6d.) and a print (5s.) by the Publishing Dept., 214 Clyde Street, Glasgow, C.1.

J. M. P.